

LECTURES ON HECKE ALGEBRAS WITH UNEQUAL PARAMETERS

G. LUSZTIG

These are notes for lectures given at MIT during the Fall of 1999.

1. COXETER GROUPS

1.1. Let S be a finite set and let $M = (m_{s,s'})_{(s,s') \in S \times S}$ be a matrix with entries in $\mathbf{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ such that $m_{s,s} = 1$ for all s and $m_{s,s'} = m_{s',s} \geq 2$ for all $s \neq s'$. (A "Coxeter matrix".) Let W be the group defined by the generators $s (s \in S)$ and relations

$$(ss')^{m_{s,s'}} = 1$$

for any s, s' in S such that $m_{s,s'} < \infty$. (A "Coxeter group".) In W we have $s^2 = 1$ for all s .

Clearly, there is a unique homomorphism $\text{sgn} : W \rightarrow \{1, -1\}$ such that $\text{sgn}(s) = -1$ for all s . ("Sign representation".)

For $w \in W$ let $l(w)$ be the smallest integer $q \geq 0$ such that $w = s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ with $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_q$ in S . (We then say that $w = s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ is a *reduced expression* and $l(w)$ is the *length* of w .) Note that $l(1) = 0, l(s) = 1$ for $s \in S$. (Indeed, $s \neq 1$ in W since $\text{sgn}(s) = -1, \text{sgn}(1) = 1$.)

Lemma 1.2. *Let $w \in W, s \in S$.*

- (a) *We have either $l(sw) = l(w) + 1$ or $l(sw) = l(w) - 1$.*
- (b) *We have either $l(ws) = l(w) + 1$ or $l(ws) = l(w) - 1$.*

Clearly, $\text{sgn}(w) = (-1)^{l(w)}$. Since $\text{sgn}(sw) = -\text{sgn}(w)$, we have $(-1)^{l(sw)} = -(-1)^{l(w)}$. Hence $l(sw) \neq l(w)$. This, together with the obvious inequalities $l(w) - 1 \leq l(sw) \leq l(w) + 1$ gives (a). The proof of (b) is similar.

Proposition 1.3. *Let E be an $\mathbf{R}$ -vector space with basis $(e_s)_{s \in S}$. For $s \in S$ let $\sigma_s : E \rightarrow E$ be the linear map defined by*

$$\sigma_s(e_{s'}) = e_{s'} + 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{m_{s,s'}} e_s \text{ for all } s' \in S.$$

(a) *There is a unique homomorphism $\sigma : W \rightarrow GL(E)$ such that $\sigma(s) = \sigma_s$ for all $s \in S$.*

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$ -TEX

(b) If $s \neq s'$ in S , then ss' has order $m_{s,s'}$ in W . In particular, $s \neq s'$ in W .

We have $\sigma_s(e_s) = -e_s$ and σ induces the identity map on $E/\mathbf{R}e_s$. It follows that $\sigma_s^2 = 1$. Now let $s \neq s'$ in S . Let $m = m_{s,s'}$ and let $\Phi = \sigma_s \sigma_{s'}$. We have

$$\Phi(e_s) = (4 \cos^2 \frac{\pi}{m} - 1)e_s + 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{m} e_{s'},$$

$$\Phi(e_{s'}) = -2 \cos \frac{\pi}{m} e_s - e_{s'}.$$

Hence Φ restricts to an endomorphism ϕ of $\mathbf{R}e_s \oplus \mathbf{R}e_{s'}$ whose characteristic polynomial is

$$X^2 - 2 \cos \frac{2\pi}{m} X + 1 = (X - e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}/m})(X - e^{-2\pi\sqrt{-1}/m}).$$

It follows that, if $2 < m < \infty$, then $1 + \phi + \phi^2 + \dots + \phi^{m-1} = 0$. The same is true if $m = 2$ (in this case we see directly that $\phi = -1$). Since Φ induces the identity map on $E/(\mathbf{R}e_s \oplus \mathbf{R}e_{s'})$, it follows that $\Phi : E \rightarrow E$ has order m (if $m < \infty$). If $m = \infty$, we have $\phi \neq 1$ and $(\phi - 1)^2 = 0$, hence ϕ has infinite order and Φ has also infinite order. Now both (a), (b) follow.

Corollary 1.4. *Let $s_1 \neq s_2$ in S . Let $\langle s_1, s_2 \rangle$ be the subgroup of W generated by s_1, s_2 . For $k \geq 0$ let $1_k = s_1 s_2 s_1 \dots$ (k factors), $2_k = s_2 s_1 s_2 \dots$ (k factors).*

(a) *Assume that $m = m_{s_1, s_2} < \infty$. Then $\langle s_1, s_2 \rangle$ consists of the elements $1_k, 2_k$ ($k = 0, 1, \dots, m$); these elements are distinct except for the equalities $1_0 = 2_0, 1_m = 2_m$. For $k \in [0, m]$ we have $l(1_k) = l(2_k) = k$.*

(b) *Assume that $m_{s_1, s_2} = \infty$. Then $\langle s_1, s_2 \rangle$ consists of the elements $1_k, 2_k$ ($k = 0, 1, \dots$); these elements are distinct except for the equality $1_0 = 2_0$. For all $k \geq 0$ we have $l(1_k) = l(2_k) = k$.*

This follows immediately from 1.3(b).

We identify S with a subset of W (see 1.3(b)). Let $T = \cup_{w \in W} wSw^{-1} \subset W$.

Proposition 1.5. *Let $R = \{1, -1\} \times T$. For $s \in S$ let $U_s : R \rightarrow R$ be the map defined by $U_s(\epsilon, t) = (\epsilon(-1)^{\delta_{s,t}}, sts)$ where δ is the Kronecker symbol. There is a unique homomorphism U of W into the group of permutations of R such that $U(s) = U_s$ for all $s \in S$.*

We have $U_s^2(\epsilon, t) = (\epsilon(-1)^{\delta_{s,t} + \delta_{s,sts}}, t) = (\epsilon, t)$ since the conditions $s = t, s = sts$ are equivalent. Thus, $U_s^2 = 1$. For $s \neq s'$ in S with $m = m_{s,s'} < \infty$ we have

$$U_s U_{s'}(\epsilon, t) = (\epsilon(-1)^{\delta_{s',t} + \delta_{s,s'ts'}}, ss'ts's)$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} (U_s U_{s'})^m(\epsilon, t) &= (\epsilon(-1)^{\delta_{s',t} + \delta_{s,s'ts'} + \delta_{s',ss'ts's} + \delta_{s,s'ss'ts'ss'} + \dots}, (ss')^m t (s's)^m) \\ &= (\epsilon(-1)^{\delta_{s',t} + \delta_{s'ss',t} + \delta_{s'ss'ss',t} + \dots}, t) \end{aligned}$$

(both sums have exactly $2m$ terms). It is enough to show that $\delta_{s',t} + \delta_{s'ss',t} + \delta_{s'ss'ss',t} + \dots$ is even, or that t appears an even number of times in the $2m$ -term sequence $s', s'ss', s'ss'ss', \dots$. This follows from the fact that in this sequence the k -th terms is equal to the $(k+m)$ -th term for $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$.

Proposition 1.6. *Let $w \in W$.*

(a) *If $w = s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ is a reduced expression, then the elements*

$$s_1, s_1 s_2 s_1, s_1 s_2 s_3 s_2 s_1, \dots, s_1 s_2 \dots s_q \dots s_2 s_1$$

are distinct.

(b) *These elements form a subset of T that depends only on w , not on the choice of reduced expression for it.*

Assume that $s_1 s_2 \dots s_i \dots s_2 s_1 = s_1 s_2 \dots s_j \dots s_2 s_1$ for some $1 \leq i < j \leq q$. Then $s_i = s_{i+1} s_{i+2} \dots s_j \dots s_{i+2} s_{i+1}$ hence

$$\begin{aligned} s_1 s_2 \dots s_q &= s_1 s_2 \dots s_{i-1} (s_{i+1} s_{i+2} \dots s_j \dots s_{i+2} s_{i+1}) s_{i+1} \dots s_j s_{j+1} \dots s_q \\ &= s_1 s_2 \dots s_{i-1} s_{i+1} s_{i+2} \dots s_{j-1} s_{j+1} \dots s_q, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that $l(w) \leq q - 2$, contradiction. This proves (a).

For $(\epsilon, t) \in R$ we have (see 1.5) $U(w^{-1})(\epsilon, t) = (\epsilon \eta(w, t), w^{-1} t w)$ where $\eta(w, t) = \pm 1$ depends only on w, t . On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} U(w^{-1})(\epsilon, t) &= U_{s_q} \dots U_{s_1}(\epsilon, t) \\ &= (\epsilon(-1)^{\delta_{s_1, t} + \delta_{s_2, s_1 t s_1} + \dots + \delta_{s_q, s_{q-1} \dots s_1 t s_1 \dots s_{q-1}}}, w^{-1} t w) \\ &= (\epsilon(-1)^{\delta_{s_1, t} + \delta_{s_1 s_2 s_1, t} + \dots + \delta_{s_1 \dots s_q \dots s_1, t}}, w^{-1} t w). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\eta(w, t) = (-1)^{\delta_{s_1, t} + \delta_{s_1 s_2 s_1, t} + \dots + \delta_{s_1 \dots s_q \dots s_1, t}}$. Using (a), we see that for $t \in T$, the sum $\delta_{s_1, t} + \delta_{s_1 s_2 s_1, t} + \dots + \delta_{s_1 \dots s_q \dots s_1, t}$ is 1 if t belongs to the subset in (b) and is 0, otherwise. Hence the subset in (b) is just $\{t \in T \mid \eta(w, t) = -1\}$. This completes the proof.

Proposition 1.7. *Let $w \in W, s \in S$ be such that $l(sw) = l(w) - 1$. Let $w = s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ be a reduced expression. Then there exists $j \in [1, q]$ such that*

$$s s_1 s_2 \dots s_{j-1} = s_1 s_2 \dots s_j.$$

Let $w' = sw$. Let $w' = s'_1 s'_2 \dots s'_{q-1}$ be a reduced expression. Then $w = s s'_1 s'_2 \dots s'_{q-1}$ is another reduced expression. By 1.6(b), the q -term sequences

$$s_1, s_1 s_2 s_1, s_1 s_2 s_3 s_2 s_1, \dots \text{ and } s, s s'_1 s, s s'_1 s'_2 s'_1 s, \dots$$

coincide up to rearranging terms. In particular, $s = s_1 s_2 \dots s_j \dots s_2 s_1$ for some $j \in [1, q]$. The proposition follows.

1.8. Let X be the set of all sequences $(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_q)$ in W such that $s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ is a reduced expression in W . We regard X as the vertices of a graph in which $(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_q), (s'_1, s'_2, \dots, s'_{q'})$ are joined if one is obtained from the other by replacing m consecutive entries of form $s, s', s, s', \dots$ by the m entries $s', s, s', s, \dots$; here $s \neq s'$ in S are such that $m = m_{s, s'} < \infty$. We use the notation

$$(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_q) \sim (s'_1, s'_2, \dots, s'_{q'})$$

for " $(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_q), (s'_1, s'_2, \dots, s'_{q'})$ are in the same connected component of X ". (When this holds we have necessarily $q = q'$ and $s_1 s_2 \dots s_q = s'_1 s'_2 \dots s'_{q'}$ in W .)

Theorem 1.9. *Let $(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_q), (s'_1, s'_2, \dots, s'_q)$ in X be such that $s_1 s_2 \dots s_q = s'_1 s'_2 \dots s'_q = w \in W$. Then $(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_q) \sim (s'_1, s'_2, \dots, s'_q)$.*

We shall use the following notation.

Let $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_q), \mathbf{s}' = (s'_1, s'_2, \dots, s'_q)$. Let C (resp. C') be the connected component of X that contains $\mathbf{s}$ (resp. $\mathbf{s}'$). For $i \in [1, q]$ we set

$\mathbf{s}(i) = (\dots, s'_1, s_1, s'_1, s'_1, s_1, s_2, s_3, \dots, s_i)$ (a q -elements sequence in S),

$\underline{\mathbf{s}}(i) = \dots s'_1 s_1 s'_1 s'_1 s_1 s_2 s_3 \dots s_i \in W$ (the product of this sequence).

Let $C(i)$ be the connected component of X that contains $\mathbf{s}(i)$. Then $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{s}(q)$. Hence $C = C(q)$.

We argue by induction on q . The theorem is obvious for $q \leq 1$. We now assume that $q \geq 2$ and that the theorem is known for $q - 1$. We first prove the following weaker statement.

(A) *In the setup of the theorem we have either*

$(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_q) \sim (s'_1, s'_2, \dots, s'_q)$, or

(a) $s_1 s_2 \dots s_q = s'_1 s_1 s_2 \dots s_{q-1}$ and $(s'_1, s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{q-1}) \sim (s'_1, s'_2, \dots, s'_q)$.

We have $l(s'_1 w) = l(w) - 1$. By 1.7 we have $s'_1 s_1 s_2 \dots s_{i-1} = s_1 s_2 \dots s_i$ for some $i \in [1, q]$, so that $w = s'_1 s_1 s_2 \dots s_{i-1} s_{i+1} \dots s_q$. In particular,

$(s'_1, s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{i-1}, s_{i+1}, \dots, s_q) \in X$.

By the induction hypothesis, we have $(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{i-1}, s_{i+1}, \dots, s_q) \sim (s'_2, \dots, s'_q)$. Hence

(b) $(s'_1, s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{i-1}, s_{i+1}, \dots, s_q) \sim (s'_1, s'_2, \dots, s'_q)$.

Assume first that $i < q$. Then from $s'_1 s_1 s_2 \dots s_{i-1} s_{i+1} \dots s_{q-1} = s_1 s_2 \dots s_{q-1}$ and the induction hypothesis we deduce that

$(s'_1, s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{i-1}, s_{i+1}, \dots, s_{q-1}) \sim (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{q-1})$, hence

$(s'_1, s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{i-1}, s_{i+1}, \dots, s_{q-1}, s_q) \in C$.

Combining this with (b) we deduce that $C = C'$.

Assume next that $i = q$ so that $s_1 s_2 \dots s_q = s'_1 s_1 s_2 \dots s_{q-1}$. Then (b) shows that (a) holds. Thus, (A) is proved.

Next we prove for $p \in [0, q - 2]$ the following generalization of (A).

(A'_p) *In the setup of the theorem we have either $C = C'$ or:*

for $i \in [q - p - 1, q]$ we have $\mathbf{s}(i) \in X, \underline{\mathbf{s}}(i) = w, C_i = C$ if $i \equiv q \pmod{2}$ and $C_i = C'$ if $i \equiv q + 1 \pmod{2}$.

For $p = 0$ this reduces to (A). Assume now that $p > 0$ and that (A'_{p-1}) is already known. We prove that (A'_p) holds.

If $C = C'$, then we are done. Hence by (A'_{p-1}) we may assume that: for $i \in [q - p, q]$ we have $\mathbf{s}(i) \in X, \underline{\mathbf{s}}(i) = w, C_i = C$ if $i \equiv q \pmod{2}$ and $C_i = C'$ if $i \equiv q + 1 \pmod{2}$.

Applying (A) to $\mathbf{s}(q - p), \mathbf{s}(q - p + 1)$ (instead of $\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}'$), we see that either $C_{q-p} = C_{q-p+1}$ or:

$\mathbf{s}(q - p), \mathbf{s}(q - p - 1)$ are in $X, \underline{\mathbf{s}}(q - p) = \underline{\mathbf{s}}(q - p - 1)$ and $C_{q-p-1} = C_{q-p+1}$.

In both cases, we see that (A'_p) holds.

This completes the inductive proof of (A'_p) . In particular, (A'_{q-2}) holds. In other words, in the setup of the theorem, either $C = C'$ holds or:

(c) for $i \in [1, q]$ we have $\mathbf{s}(i) \in X$, $\underline{\mathbf{s}}(i) = w$, $C_i = C$ if $i = q \pmod 2$ and $C_i = C'$ if $i = q + 1 \pmod 2$.

If $C = C'$, then we are done. Hence we may assume that (c) holds. In particular,

(d) $\mathbf{s}(2) \in X$, $\mathbf{s}(1) \in X$, $\underline{\mathbf{s}}(2) = \underline{\mathbf{s}}(1)$.

From $\mathbf{s}(1) \in X$ and $q \geq 2$ we see that $s' \neq s$ and that $q \leq m = m_{s,s'}$. From $\underline{\mathbf{s}}(2) = \underline{\mathbf{s}}(1)$ we see that $s_2 \in \langle s_1, s'_1 \rangle$, hence s_2 is either s_1 or s'_1 . In fact we cannot have $s_2 = s_1$ since this would contradict $\mathbf{s}(2) \in X$. Hence $s_2 = s'_1$. We see that $\mathbf{s}(2) = (\dots, s'_1, s_1, s'_1, s_1, s'_1)$ (the number of terms is q , $q \leq m$). Since $\underline{\mathbf{s}}(2) = \underline{\mathbf{s}}(1)$, it follows that $q = m$, so that $\mathbf{s}(2), \mathbf{s}(1)$ are joined in X . It follows that $C_2 = C_1$. By (c), for some permutation a, b of $1, 2$ we have $C_a = C, C_b = C'$. Since $C_a = C_b$ it follows that $C = C'$. It follows that $C = C'$. The theorem is proved.

Proposition 1.10. *Let $w \in W$ and let $s, t \in S$ be such that $l(swt) = l(w), l(sw) = l(wt)$. Then $sw = wt$.*

Let $w = s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ be a reduced expression.

Assume first that $l(wt) = q + 1$. Then $s_1 s_2 \dots s_q t$ is a reduced expression for wt . Now $l(swt) = l(wt) - 1$ hence by 1.7 there exists $i \in [1, q]$ such that $ss_1 s_2 \dots s_{i-1} = s_1 s_2 \dots s_i$ or else $ss_1 s_2 \dots s_q = s_1 s_2 \dots s_q t$. If the second alternative occurs, we are done. If the first alternative occurs, we have $sw = s_1 s_2 \dots s_{i-1} s_{i+1} \dots s_q$ hence $l(sw) \leq q - 1$. This contradicts $l(sw) = l(wt)$.

Assume next that $l(wt) = q - 1$. Let $w' = wt$. Then $l(sw't) = l(w'), l(sw') = l(w't)$. We have $l(w't) = l(w') + 1$ hence the first part of the proof applies and gives $sw' = w't$. Hence $sw = wt$. The proposition is proved.

1.11. We can regard S as the set of vertices of a graph in which s, s' are joined if $m_{s,s'} > 2$. We say that W is *irreducible* if this graph is connected. It is easy to see that in general, W is naturally a product of irreducible Coxeter groups, corresponding to the connected components of S .

In the setup of 1.3, let $(,) : E \times E \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be the symmetric $\mathbf{R}$ -bilinear form given by $(e_s, e_{s'}) = -\cos \frac{\pi}{m_{s,s'}}$. Then $\sigma(w) : E \rightarrow E$ preserves $(,)$ for any $w \in W$. We say that W is *tame* if $(e, e) \geq 0$ for any $e \in E$. It is easy to see that, if W is finite then W is tame.

We say that W is *integral* if, for any $s \neq s'$ in S , we have $4 \cos^2 \frac{\pi}{m_{s,s'}} \in \mathbf{Z}$ (or equivalently $m_{s,s'} \in \{2, 3, 4, 6, \infty\}$).

We will be mainly interested in the case where W is tame. The tame, irreducible W are of three kinds:

- (a) finite, integral;
- (b) finite, non-integral;
- (c) tame, infinite (and automatically integral).

The W of type (c) are called *affine Weyl groups*.

2. PARTIAL ORDER ON W

2.1. Let y, w be two elements of W . We say that $y \leq w$ if there exists a sequence $y = y_0, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n = w$ such that $l(y_k) - l(y_{k-1}) = 1$ for $k \in [1, n]$ and $y_k y_{k-1}^{-1} \in T$ (or equivalently $y_{k-1} y_k^{-1} \in T$, or $y_k^{-1} y_{k-1} \in T$, or $y_{k-1}^{-1} y_k \in T$) for $k \in [1, n]$.

This is clearly a partial order on W . Note that $y \leq w$ implies $l(y) \leq l(w)$. Also, $y \leq w$ implies $y^{-1} \leq w^{-1}$. If $w \in W, s \in S$ then, clearly:

$sw < w$ if and only if $l(sw) = l(w) - 1$;

$sw > w$ if and only if $l(sw) = l(w) + 1$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $w = s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ be a reduced expression and let $t \in T$. The following are equivalent:*

(i) $U(w^{-1})(\epsilon, t) = (-\epsilon, w^{-1}tw)$ for $\epsilon = \pm 1$;

(ii) $t = s_1 s_2 \dots s_i \dots s_2 s_1$ for some $i \in [1, q]$;

(iii) $l(tw) < l(w)$.

The equivalence of (i), (ii) has been proved earlier.

Proof of (ii) $\implies$ (iii). Assume that (ii) holds. Then $tw = s_1 \dots s_{i-1} s_{i+1} \dots s_q$ hence $l(tw) < q$ and (iii) holds.

Proof of (iii) $\implies$ (i). First we check that

(a) $U(t)(\epsilon, t) = (-\epsilon, t)$.

If $t \in S$, (a) is clear. If (a) is true for t then it is also true for sts where $s \in S$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} U(sts)(\epsilon, sts) &= U_s U(t) U_s(\epsilon, sts) = U_s U(t)(\epsilon(-1)^{\delta_{s, sts}}, t) = U_s(-\epsilon(-1)^{\delta_{s, sts}}, t) \\ &= (-\epsilon(-1)^{\delta_{s, sts} + \delta_{s, t}}, t) = (-\epsilon, t); \end{aligned}$$

(a) follows. Assume now that (i) does not hold; thus, $U(w^{-1})(\epsilon, t) = (\epsilon, w^{-1}tw)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} U((tw)^{-1})(\epsilon, t) &= U(w^{-1})U(t)(\epsilon, t) = U(w^{-1})(-\epsilon, t) = (-\epsilon, w^{-1}tw) \\ &= (-\epsilon, (tw)^{-1}t(tw)). \end{aligned}$$

Since (i) $\implies$ (iii) we deduce that $l(w) < l(tw)$; thus, (iii) does not hold. The lemma is proved.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $y, z \in W$ and let $s \in S$. If $sy \leq z < sz$, then $y \leq sz$.*

We argue by induction on $l(z) - l(sy)$. If $l(z) - l(sy) = 0$ then $z = sy$ and the result is clear. Now assume that $l(z) > l(sy)$. Then $sy < z$. We can assume that $sy < y$ (otherwise the result is trivial). We can find $t \in T$ such that $sy < tsy \leq z$ and $l(tsy) = l(sy) + 1$. If $t = s$, then $y \leq z$ and we are done. Hence we may assume that $t \neq s$. We show that

(a) $y < tsy$.

Assume that (a) does not hold. Then $y, tsy, sy, stsy$ have lengths $q+1, q+1, q, q$.

We can find a reduced expression $y = ss_1s_2 \dots s_q$. Since $l(stsy) < l(y)$, we see from 2.2 that either $sts = ss_1 \dots s_i \dots s_1s$ for some $i \in [1, q]$ or $sts = s$. (This last case has been excluded.) It follows that

$$tsy = s_1 \dots s_i \dots s_1ss_1s_2 \dots s_q = s_1 \dots s_{i-1}s_{i+1} \dots s_q.$$

Thus, $l(tsy) \leq q - 1$, a contradiction. Thus, (a) holds. Let $y' = tsy$. We have $sy' \leq z \leq sz$ and $l(z) - l(sy') < l(z) - l(sy)$. By the induction hypothesis, we have $y' \leq sz$. We have $y < y'$ by (a), hence $y \leq sz$. The lemma is proved.

Proposition 2.4. *The following three conditions on $y, w \in W$ are equivalent:*

- (i) $y \leq w$;
- (ii) for any reduced expression $w = s_1s_2 \dots s_q$ there exists a subsequence $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_r$ of $1, 2, \dots, q$ such that $y = s_{i_1}s_{i_2} \dots s_{i_r}$, $r = l(y)$;
- (iii) there exists a reduced expression $w = s_1s_2 \dots s_q$ and a subsequence $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_r$ of $1, 2, \dots, q$ such that $y = s_{i_1}s_{i_2} \dots s_{i_r}$.

Proof of (i) $\implies$ (ii). We may assume that $y < w$. Let $y = y_0, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n = w$ be as in 2.1. Let $w = s_1s_2 \dots s_q$ be a reduced expression. Since $y_{n-1}y_n^{-1} \in T$, $l(y_{n-1}) = l(y_n) - 1$, we see from 2.2 that there exists $i \in [1, q]$ such that $y_{n-1}y_n^{-1} = s_1s_2 \dots s_i \dots s_2s_1$ hence $y_{n-1} = s_1s_2 \dots s_{i-1}s_{i+1} \dots s_q$. This is a reduced expression. Similarly, since $y_{n-2}y_{n-1}^{-1} \in T$, $l(y_{n-2}) = l(y_{n-1}) - 1$, we see from 2.2 (applied to y_{n-1}) that there exists $j \in [1, q] - \{i\}$ such that y_{n-2} equals

$s_1s_2 \dots s_{i-1}s_{i+1} \dots s_{j-1}s_{j+1} \dots s_q$ or $s_1s_2 \dots s_{j-1}s_{j+1} \dots s_{i-1}s_{i+1} \dots s_q$
(depending on whether $i < j$ or $i > j$). Continuing in this way we see that y is of the required form.

Proof of (ii) $\implies$ (iii). This is trivial.

Proof of (iii) $\implies$ (i). Assume that $w = s_1s_2 \dots s_q$ (reduced expression) and $y = s_{i_1}s_{i_2} \dots s_{i_r}$ where $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_r$ is a subsequence of $1, 2, \dots, q$. We argue by induction on q . If $q = 0$ there is nothing to prove. Now assume $q > 0$.

If $i_1 > 1$, then the induction hypothesis is applicable to $y, w' = s_2 \dots s_q$ and yields $y \leq w'$. But $w' \leq w$ hence $y \leq w$. If $i_1 = 1$ then the induction hypothesis is applicable to $y' = s_{i_2} \dots s_{i_r}, w' = s_2 \dots s_q$ and yields $y' \leq w'$. Thus, $s_1y \leq s_1w < w$. By 2.3 we then have $y \leq w$. The proposition is proved.

Corollary 2.5. *Let $y, z \in W$ and let $s \in S$.*

- (a) Assume that $sz < z$. Then $y \leq z \leftrightarrow sy \leq z$.
- (b) Assume that $y < sy$. Then $y \leq z \leftrightarrow y \leq sz$.

We prove (a). We can find a reduced expression of z of form $z = ss_1s_2 \dots s_q$. Assume that $y \leq z$. By 2.4 we can find a subsequence $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_r$ of $1, 2, \dots, q$ such that either $y = s_{i_1}s_{i_2} \dots s_{i_r}$ or $y = ss_{i_1}s_{i_2} \dots s_{i_r}$. In the first case we have $sy = ss_{i_1}s_{i_2} \dots s_{i_r}$ and in the second case we have $sy = s_{i_1}s_{i_2} \dots s_{i_r}$. In both cases we have $sy \leq z$ by 2.4. The same argument shows that, if $sy \leq z$ then $y \leq z$. This proves (a).

We prove (b). Assume that $y \leq z$. We must prove that $y \leq sz$. If $z < sz$, this is clear. Thus we may assume that $sz < z$. We can find a reduced expression of

z of form $z = ss_1s_2 \dots s_q$. By 2.4 we can find a subsequence $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_r$ of $1, 2, \dots, q$ such that either $y = s_{i_1}s_{i_2} \dots s_{i_r}, l(y) = r$ or $y = ss_{i_1}s_{i_2} \dots s_{i_r}, l(y) = r + 1$. In the second case we have $l(sy) = r < l(y)$, contradicting $y < sy$. Thus we are in the first case. Hence y is the product of a subsequence of $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_q$ and using again 2.4, we deduce that $y \leq sz$ (note that $sz = s_1s_2 \dots s_q$ is a reduced expression). The lemma is proved.

3. THE ALGEBRA $\mathcal{H}$

3.1. A map $L : W \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ is said to be a *weight function* for W if $L(ww') = L(w) + L(w')$ for any $w, w' \in W$ such that $l(ww') = l(w) + l(w')$. We will assume that a weight function $L : W \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ is fixed; we then say that W, L is a *weighted Coxeter group*. (For example we could take $L = l$; in that case we say that we are in the *split case*.) Note that L is determined by its values $L(s)$ on S which are subject only to the condition that $L(s) = L(s')$ for any $s \neq s'$ in S such that $m_{s,s'}$ is finite and odd. We necessarily have $L(1) = 0$ and $L(w) = L(w^{-1})$ for all $w \in W$.

Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathbf{Z}[v, v^{-1}]$ where v is an indeterminate. For $s \in S$ we set $v_s = v^{L(s)} \in \mathcal{A}$.

3.2. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the $\mathcal{A}$ -algebra with 1 defined by the generators $T_s (s \in S)$ and the relations

$$(a) (T_s - v_s)(T_s + v_s^{-1}) = 0 \text{ for } s \in S;$$

$$(b) T_s T_{s'} T_s \dots = T_{s'} T_s T_{s'} \dots$$

(both products have $m_{s,s'}$ factors) for any $s \neq s'$ in S such that $m_{s,s'} < \infty$.

$\mathcal{H}$ is called the *Hecke algebra* or the *Iwahori-Hecke algebra*.

For $w \in W$ we define $T_w \in \mathcal{H}$ by $T_w = T_{s_1} T_{s_2} \dots T_{s_q}$, where $w = s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ is a reduced expression. By (b) and 1.9, T_w is independent of the choice of reduced expression. From the definitions it is clear that for $s \in S, w \in W$ we have

$$T_s T_w = T_{sw} \text{ if } l(sw) = l(w) + 1,$$

$$T_s T_w = T_{sw} + (v_s - v_s^{-1}) T_w \text{ if } l(sw) = l(w) - 1.$$

In particular, the $\mathcal{A}$ -submodule of $\mathcal{H}$ generated by $\{T_w | w \in W\}$ is a left ideal of $\mathcal{H}$. It contains $1 = T_1$ hence it is the whole of $\mathcal{H}$. Thus $\{T_w | w \in W\}$ generates the $\mathcal{A}$ -module $\mathcal{H}$.

Proposition 3.3. $\{T_w | w \in W\}$ is an $\mathcal{A}$ -basis of $\mathcal{H}$.

We consider the free $\mathcal{A}$ -module $\mathcal{E}$ with basis $(e_w)_{w \in W}$. For any $s \in S$ we define $\mathcal{A}$ -linear maps $P_s : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}, Q_s : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ by

$$P_s(e_w) = e_{sw} \text{ if } l(sw) = l(w) + 1,$$

$$P_s(e_w) = e_{sw} + (v_s - v_s^{-1})e_w \text{ if } l(sw) = l(w) - 1;$$

$$Q_s(e_w) = e_{ws} \text{ if } l(ws) = l(w) + 1,$$

$$Q_s(e_w) = e_{ws} + (v_s - v_s^{-1})e_w \text{ if } l(ws) = l(w) - 1.$$

We shall continue the proof assuming that

$$(a) P_s Q_t = Q_t P_s \text{ for any } s, t \text{ in } S.$$

Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be the $\mathcal{A}$ -subalgebra with 1 of $\text{End}(\mathcal{E})$ generated by $\{P_s | s \in S\}$. The map

$\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ given by $\pi \mapsto \pi(e_1)$ is surjective. Indeed, if $w = s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ is a reduced expression, then $e_w = P_{s_1} \dots P_{s_q} e_1$. Assume now that $\pi \in \mathfrak{A}$ satisfies $\pi(e_1) = 0$.

Let $\pi' = Q_{s_q} \dots Q_{s_1}$. By (a) we have $\pi\pi' = \pi'\pi$ hence

$$0 = \pi'\pi(e_1) = \pi\pi'(e_1) = \pi(Q_{s_q} \dots Q_{s_1}(e_1)) = \pi(e_w).$$

Since w is arbitrary, it follows that $\pi = 0$. We see that the map $\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ is injective, hence an isomorphism of $\mathcal{A}$ -modules. Using this isomorphism we transport the algebra structure of $\mathfrak{A}$ to an algebra structure on $\mathcal{E}$ with unit element e_1 . For this algebra structure we have $P_s(e_1)\pi(e_1) = P_s(\pi(e_1))$ for $s \in S, \pi \in \mathfrak{A}$. Hence $e_s e_w = P_s(e_w)$ for any $w \in W, s \in S$. It follows that

$$(b) \ e_s e_w = e_{sw} \text{ if } l(sw) = l(w) + 1,$$

$$(c) \ e_s e_w = e_{sw} + (v_s - v_s^{-1})e_w \text{ if } l(sw) = l(w) - 1.$$

From (b) it follows that, if $w = s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ is a reduced expression, then $e_w = e_{s_1} e_{s_2} \dots e_{s_q}$. In particular, if $s \neq s'$ in S are such that $m = m_{s,s'} < \infty$ then $e_s e_{s'} e_s \dots = e_{s'} e_s e_{s'} \dots$ (both products have m factors); indeed, this follows from the equality $e_{ss's's'} = e_{s's's's'}$ (see 1.4). From (c) we deduce that $e_s^2 = 1 + (v_s - v_s^{-1})e_s$ for $s \in S$, or that $(e_s - v_s)(e_s + v_s^{-1}) = 0$. We see that there is a unique algebra homomorphism $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ preserving 1 such that $T_s \mapsto e_s$ for all $s \in S$. This homomorphism takes T_w to e_w for any $w \in W$. Assume now that $a_w \in \mathcal{A}$ ($w \in W$) are zero for all but finitely many w and that $\sum_w a_w T_w = 0$ in $\mathcal{H}$. Applying $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ we obtain $\sum_w a_w e_w = 0$. Since (e_w) is a basis of $\mathcal{E}$, it follows that $a_w = 0$ for all w . Thus, $\{T_w | w \in W\}$ is an $\mathcal{A}$ -basis of $\mathcal{H}$. This completes the proof, modulo the verification of (a).

We prove (a). Let $w \in W$. We distinguish six cases.

Case 1. swt, sw, wt, w have lengths $q+2, q+1, q+1, q$. Then

$$P_s Q_t(e_w) = Q_t P_s(e_w) = e_{swt}.$$

Case 2. w, sw, wt, swt have lengths $q+2, q+1, q+1, q$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} P_s Q_t(e_w) &= Q_t P_s(e_w) \\ &= e_{swt} + (v_t - v_t^{-1})e_{sw} + (v_s - v_s^{-1})e_{wt} + (v_t - v_t^{-1})(v_s - v_s^{-1})e_w. \end{aligned}$$

Case 3. wt, swt, w, sw have lengths $q+2, q+1, q+1, q$. Then

$$P_s Q_t(e_w) = Q_t P_s(e_w) = e_{swt} + (v_s - v_s^{-1})e_{wt}.$$

Case 4. sw, swt, w, wt have lengths $q+2, q+1, q+1, q$. Then

$$P_s Q_t(e_w) = Q_t P_s(e_w) = e_{swt} + (v_t - v_t^{-1})e_{sw}.$$

Case 5. swt, w, wt, sw have lengths $q+1, q+1, q, q$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} P_s Q_t(e_w) &= e_{swt} + (v_t - v_t^{-1})e_{sw} + (v_t - v_t^{-1})(v_s - v_s^{-1})e_w, \\ Q_t P_s(e_w) &= e_{swt} + (v_s - v_s^{-1})e_{wt} + (v_t - v_t^{-1})(v_s - v_s^{-1})e_w. \end{aligned}$$

Case 6. sw, wt, w, swt have lengths $q+1, q+1, q, q$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} P_s Q_t(e_w) &= e_{swt} + (v_s - v_s^{-1})e_{wt}, \\ Q_t P_s(e_w) &= e_{swt} + (v_t - v_t^{-1})e_{sw}. \end{aligned}$$

In case 5 we have $L(t) + L(wt) = L(w) = L(swt) = L(s) + L(wt)$ hence $L(t) = L(s)$ and $v_s = v_t$. In case 6 we have $L(t) + L(swt) = L(sw) = L(wt) = L(s) + L(swt)$, hence $L(t) = L(s)$ and $v_s = v_t$. In case 5 and 6 we have $sw = wt$ by 1.10. Hence $P_s Q_t(e_w) = Q_t P_s(e_w)$ in each case. The proposition is proved.

3.4. There is a unique involutive antiautomorphism of the algebra $\mathcal{H}$ which carries T_s to T_s for any $s \in S$. (This follows easily by looking at the defining relations of $\mathcal{H}$.) It carries T_w to $T_{w^{-1}}$ for any $w \in W$.

3.5. There is a unique algebra involution of $\mathcal{H}$ denoted $h \mapsto h^\dagger$ such that $T_s^\dagger = -T_s^{-1}$ for any $s \in S$. We have $T_w^\dagger = \text{sgn}(w)T_{w^{-1}}^{-1}$ for any $w \in W$.

4. THE BAR OPERATOR

4.1. For $s \in S$, the element $T_s \in \mathcal{H}$ is invertible: we have $T_s^{-1} = T_s - (v_s - v_s^{-1})$. It follows that T_w is invertible for each $w \in W$; if $w = s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ is a reduced expression, then $T_w^{-1} = T_{s_q}^{-1} \dots T_{s_2}^{-1} T_{s_1}^{-1}$.

Let $\bar{\cdot} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be the ring involution which takes v^n to v^{-n} for any $n \in \mathbf{Z}$.

Lemma 4.2. (a) *There is a unique ring homomorphism $\bar{\cdot} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ which is $\mathcal{A}$ -semilinear with respect to $\bar{\cdot} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ and satisfies $\bar{T}_s = T_s^{-1}$ for all $s \in S$.*

(b) *This homomorphism is involutive. It takes T_w to $T_{w^{-1}}^{-1}$ for any $w \in W$.*

The following two identities can be deduced easily from 3.2(a),(b):

$$(T_s^{-1} - v_s^{-1})(T_s^{-1} + v_s) = 0 \text{ for } s \in S,$$

$$T_s^{-1} T_{s'}^{-1} T_s^{-1} \dots = T_{s'}^{-1} T_s^{-1} T_{s'}^{-1} \dots$$

(both products have $m_{s,s'}$ factors) for any $s \neq s'$ in S such that $m_{s,s'} < \infty$; (a) follows.

We prove (b). Let $s \in S$. Applying $\bar{\cdot}$ to $T_s \bar{T}_s = 1$ gives $\bar{T}_s \bar{\bar{T}_s} = 1$. We have also $\bar{\bar{T}_s} T_s = 1$ hence $\bar{\bar{T}_s} = T_s$. It follows that the square of $\bar{\cdot}$ is 1. The second assertion of (b) is immediate. The lemma is proved.

4.3. For any $w \in W$ we can write uniquely

$$\bar{T}_w = \sum_{y \in W} \bar{r}_{y,w} T_y$$

where $r_{y,w} \in \mathcal{A}$ are zero for all but finitely many y .

Lemma 4.4. *Let $w \in W$ and $s \in S$ be such that $w > sw$. For $y \in W$ we have*

$$r_{y,w} = r_{sy,sw} \text{ if } sy < y,$$

$$r_{y,w} = r_{sy,sw} + (v_s - v_s^{-1})r_{y,sw} \text{ if } sy > y.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{T}_w &= T_s^{-1} \bar{T}_{sw} = (T_s - (v_s - v_s^{-1})) \sum_y \bar{r}_{y,sw} T_y \\ &= \sum_y \bar{r}_{y,sw} T_{sy} - \sum_y (v_s - v_s^{-1}) \bar{r}_{y,sw} T_y + \sum_{y; sy < y} (v_s - v_s^{-1}) \bar{r}_{y,sw} T_y \\ &= \sum_y \bar{r}_{sy,sw} T_y - \sum_{y; sy > y} (v_s - v_s^{-1}) \bar{r}_{y,sw} T_y. \end{aligned}$$

The lemma follows.

Lemma 4.5. *For any y, w we have $\bar{r}_{y,w} = \text{sgn}(yw)r_{y,w}$.*

We argue by induction on $l(w)$. If $w = 1$ the result is obvious. Assume now that $l(w) \geq 1$. We can find $s \in S$ such that $w > sw$. Assume first that $sy < y$. From 4.4 we see, using the induction hypothesis, that

$$\bar{r}_{y,w} = \bar{r}_{sy,sw} = \text{sgn}(sysw)r_{sy,sw} = \text{sgn}(yw)r_{y,w}.$$

Assume next that $sy > y$. From 4.4 we see, using the induction hypothesis, that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{r}_{y,w} &= \bar{r}_{sy,sw} + (v_s^{-1} - v_s)\bar{r}_{y,sw} = \text{sgn}(sysw)r_{sy,sw} + (v_s^{-1} - v_s)\text{sgn}(ysw)r_{y,sw} \\ &= \text{sgn}(yw)(r_{sy,sw} + (v_s - v_s^{-1})r_{y,sw}) = \text{sgn}(yw)r_{y,w}. \end{aligned}$$

The lemma is proved.

Lemma 4.6. *For any $x, z \in W$ we have $\sum_y \bar{r}_{x,y}r_{y,z} = \delta_{x,z}$.*

Using the fact that $\bar{}$ is an involution, we have

$$T_z = \overline{\bar{T}_z} = \overline{\sum_y \bar{r}_{y,z}T_y} = \sum_y r_{y,z}\bar{T}_y = \sum_y \sum_x r_{y,z}\bar{r}_{x,y}T_x.$$

We now compare the coefficients of T_x on both sides. The lemma follows.

Proposition 4.7. *Let $y, w \in W$.*

- (a) *If $r_{y,w} \neq 0$, then $y \leq w$.*
- (b) *Assume that $L(s) > 0$ for all $s \in S$. If $y \leq w$, then*

$$r_{y,w} = v^{L(w)-L(y)} \pmod{v^{L(w)-L(y)-1}\mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}]},$$

$$r_{y,w} = \text{sgn}(yw)v^{-L(w)+L(y)} \pmod{v^{-L(w)+L(y)+1}\mathbf{Z}[v]}.$$
- (c) *Without assumption on L , $r_{y,w} \in v^{L(w)-L(y)}\mathbf{Z}[v^2, v^{-2}]$.*

We prove (a) by induction on $l(w)$. If $w = 1$ the result is obvious. Assume now that $l(w) \geq 1$. We can find $s \in S$ such that $w > sw$. Assume first that $sy < y$. From 4.4 we see that $r_{sy,sw} \neq 0$ hence, by the induction hypothesis, $sy \leq sw$. Thus $sy \leq sw < w$ and, by 2.3, we deduce $y \leq w$. Assume next that $sy > y$. From 4.4 we see that either $r_{sy,sw} \neq 0$ or $r_{y,sw} \neq 0$ hence, by the induction hypothesis, $sy \leq sw$ or $y \leq sw$. Combining this with $y < sy$ and $sw < w$ we see that $y \leq w$. This proves (a).

We prove the first assertion of (b) by induction on $l(w)$. If $w = 1$ the result is obvious. Assume now that $l(w) \geq 1$. We can find $s \in S$ such that $w > sw$. Assume first that $sy < y$. Then we have also $sy < w$ and, using 2.5(b), we deduce $sy \leq sw$. By the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{aligned} r_{sy,sw} &= v^{L(sw)-L(sy)} + \text{strictly lower powers} \\ &= v^{L(w)-L(y)} + \text{strictly lower powers}. \end{aligned}$$

But $r_{y,w} = r_{sy,sw}$ and the result follows. Assume next that $sy > y$. From $y < sy, y \leq w$ we deduce using 2.5(b) that $y \leq sw$. By the induction hypothesis, we have

$$r_{y,sw} = v^{L(sw)-L(y)} + \text{strictly lower powers.}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} (v_s - v_s^{-1})r_{y,sw} &= v^{L(s)}v^{L(sw)-L(y)} + \text{strictly lower powers} \\ &= v^{L(w)-L(y)} + \text{strictly lower powers.} \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if $sy \leq sw$, then by the induction hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned} r_{sy,sw} &= v^{L(sw)-L(sy)} + \text{strictly lower powers} \\ &= v^{L(w)-L(y)-2L(s)} + \text{strictly lower powers} \end{aligned}$$

while if $sy \not\leq sw$ then $r_{sy,sw} = 0$ by (a). Thus, in

$$r_{y,w} = r_{sy,sw} + (v_s - v_s^{-1})r_{y,sw},$$

the term $r_{sy,sw}$ contributes only powers of v which are strictly smaller than $L(w) - L(y)$ and thus, $r_{y,w} = v^{L(w)-L(y)} + \text{strictly lower powers}$. This proves the first assertion of (b). The second assertion of (b) follows from the first using 4.5.

We prove (c) by induction on $l(w)$. If $w = 1$ the result is obvious. Assume now that $l(w) \geq 1$. We can find $s \in S$ such that $w > sw$. Assume first that $sy < y$. By the induction hypothesis, we have

$$r_{y,w} = r_{sy,sw} \in v^{L(sw)-L(sy)}\mathbf{Z}[v^2, v^{-2}] = v^{L(w)-L(y)}\mathbf{Z}[v^2, v^{-2}]$$

as required. Assume next that $sy > y$. By the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{aligned} r_{y,w} &= r_{sy,sw} + (v_s - v_s^{-1})r_{y,sw} \\ &\in v^{L(sw)-L(sy)}\mathbf{Z}[v^2, v^{-2}] + v^{L(s)}v^{L(sw)-L(y)}\mathbf{Z}[v^2, v^{-2}] = v^{L(w)-L(y)}\mathbf{Z}[v^2, v^{-2}], \end{aligned}$$

as required. The proposition is proved.

Proposition 4.8. *For any $x < z$ in W we have $\sum_{y; x \leq y \leq z} \text{sgn}(y) = 0$.*

Using 4.5 we can rewrite 4.6 (in our case) in the form

$$(a) \sum_y \text{sgn}(xy) r_{x,y} r_{y,z} = 0.$$

Here we may restrict the summation to y such that $x \leq y \leq z$. In the rest of the proof we shall take $L = l$. Then 4.7(b) holds and we see that if $x \leq y \leq z$, then

$$r_{x,y} r_{y,z} \text{ is } v^{l(y)-l(x)} v^{l(z)-l(y)} + \text{strictly lower powers of } v.$$

Hence (a) states that

$$\sum_{y; x \leq y \leq z} \text{sgn}(xy) v^{l(z)-l(x)} + \text{strictly lower powers of } v \text{ is } 0.$$

In particular $\sum_{y; x \leq y \leq z} \text{sgn}(xy) = 0$. The proposition is proved.

4.9. The involution $\bar{\cdot} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ commutes with the involution in 3.4. (This is clear on the generators of $\mathcal{H}$.) It follows that

$$(a) r_{y^{-1}, w^{-1}} = r_{y,w}$$

for any $y, w \in W$.

On the other hand, it is clear that $\bar{\cdot} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ and ${}^\dagger : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ commute.

5. THE ELEMENTS c_w

5.1. For any $n \in \mathbf{Z}$ let

$$\mathcal{A}_{\leq n} = \bigoplus_{m; m \leq n} \mathbf{Z}v^m, \mathcal{A}_{\geq n} = \bigoplus_{m; m \geq n} \mathbf{Z}v^m, \mathcal{A}_{< n} = \bigoplus_{m; m < n} \mathbf{Z}v^m, \mathcal{A}_{> n} = \bigoplus_{m; m > n} \mathbf{Z}v^m. \blacksquare$$

Note that $\mathcal{A}_{\leq 0} = \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}]$.

Let $\mathcal{H}_{\leq 0} = \bigoplus_w \mathcal{A}_{\leq 0} T_w$, $\mathcal{H}_{< 0} = \bigoplus_w \mathcal{A}_{< 0} T_w$. We have $\mathcal{H}_{< 0} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\leq 0} \subset \mathcal{H}$.

Theorem 5.2. (a) Let $w \in W$. There exists a unique element $c_w \in \mathcal{H}_{\leq 0}$ such that $\bar{c}_w = c_w$ and $c_w = T_w \pmod{\mathcal{H}_{< 0}}$.

(b) $\{c_w | w \in W\}$ is an $\mathcal{A}_{\leq 0}$ -basis of $\mathcal{H}_{\leq 0}$ and an $\mathcal{A}$ -basis of $\mathcal{H}$.

We prove the existence part of (a). We will construct, for any x such that $x \leq w$, an element $u_x \in \mathcal{A}_{\leq 0}$ such that

(c) $u_w = 1$,

(d) $u_x \in \mathcal{A}_{< 0}$, $\bar{u}_x - u_x = \sum_{y; x < y \leq w} r_{x,y} u_y$ for any $x < w$.

We argue by induction on $l(w) - l(x)$. If $l(w) - l(x) = 0$ then $x = w$ and we define u_x by (c). Assume now that $l(w) - l(x) > 0$ and that u_z is already defined whenever $z \leq w$, $l(w) - l(z) < l(w) - l(x)$ so that (c) holds and (d) holds if x is replaced by any such z . Then the right hand side of the equality in (d) is defined. We denote it by $a_x \in \mathcal{A}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} a_x + \bar{a}_x &= \sum_{y; x < y \leq w} r_{x,y} u_y + \sum_{y; x < y \leq w} \bar{r}_{x,y} \bar{u}_y \\ &= \sum_{y; x < y \leq w} r_{x,y} u_y + \sum_{y; x < y \leq w} \bar{r}_{x,y} (u_y + \sum_{z; y < z \leq w} r_{y,z} u_z) \\ &= \sum_{z; z < y \leq w} r_{z,y} u_y + \sum_{z; x < z \leq w} \bar{r}_{x,z} u_z + \sum_{z; x < z \leq w} \sum_{y; x < y < z} \bar{r}_{x,y} r_{y,z} u_z \\ &= \sum_{z; x < z \leq w} \sum_{y; x \leq y \leq z} \bar{r}_{x,y} r_{y,z} u_z = \sum_{z; x < z \leq w} \delta_{x,z} u_z = 0. \end{aligned}$$

(We have used 4.6 and the equality $r_{y,y} = 1$.) Since $a_x + \bar{a}_x = 0$, we have $a_x = \sum_{n \in \mathbf{Z}} \gamma_n v^n$ (finite sum) where $\gamma_n \in \mathbf{Z}$ satisfy $\gamma_n + \gamma_{-n} = 0$ for all n and in particular, $\gamma_0 = 0$. Then $u_x = \sum_{n < 0} \gamma_n v^n \in \mathcal{A}_{< 0}$ satisfies $\bar{u}_x - u_x = a_x$. This completes the inductive construction of the elements u_x . We now define $c_w = \sum_{y; y \leq w} u_y T_y \in \mathcal{H}_{\leq 0}$. It is clear that $c_w = T_w \pmod{\mathcal{H}_{< 0}}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{c}_w &= \sum_{y; y \leq w} \bar{u}_y \bar{T}_y = \sum_{y; y \leq w} \bar{u}_y \sum_{x; x \leq y} \bar{r}_{x,y} T_x = \sum_{x; x \leq w} \left(\sum_{y; x \leq y \leq w} \bar{r}_{x,y} \bar{u}_y \right) T_x \\ &= \sum_{x; x \leq w} u_x T_x = c_w. \end{aligned}$$

(We have used the fact that $r_{x,y} \neq 0$ implies $x \leq y$, see 4.7, and (d).) Thus, the existence of the element c_w is established.

To prove uniqueness, it suffices to verify the following statement:

(e) *If $h \in \mathcal{H}_{<0}$ satisfies $\bar{h} = h$ then $h = 0$.*

We can write uniquely $h = \sum_{y \in W} f_y T_y$ where $f_y \in \mathcal{A}_{<0}$ are zero for all but finitely many y . Assume that not all f_y are 0. Then we can find $l_0 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that

$$Y_0 = \{y \in W \mid f_y \neq 0, l(y) = l_0\} \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \{y \in W \mid f_y \neq 0, l(y) > l_0\} = \emptyset.$$

The equality $\sum_y f_y T_y = \overline{\sum_y f_y T_y}$ implies then

$$\sum_{y \in Y_0} f_y T_y = \sum_{y \in Y_0} \bar{f}_y T_y \pmod{\sum_{y; l(y) < l(y_0)} \mathcal{A} T_y}$$

hence $\bar{f}_y = f_y$ for any $y \in Y_0$. Since $f_y \in \mathcal{A}_{<0}$, it follows that $f_y = 0$ for any $y \in Y_0$, a contradiction. We have proved that $f_y = 0$ for all y ; (e) is verified and (a) is proved.

The elements c_w constructed in (a) (for various w) are related to the basis T_w by a triangular matrix (with respect to $\leq$) with 1 on the diagonal. Hence these elements satisfy (b). The theorem is proved.

5.3. For any $w \in W$ we set $c_w = \sum_{y \in W} p_{y,w} T_y$ where $p_{y,w} \in \mathcal{A}_{\leq 0}$. By the proof of 5.2 we have

$$p_{y,w} = 0 \text{ unless } y \leq w,$$

$$p_{w,w} = 1,$$

$$p_{y,w} \in \mathcal{A}_{<0} \text{ if } y < w.$$

Moreover, for any $x < w$ in W we have

$$\bar{p}_{x,w} = \sum_{y; x \leq y \leq w} r_{x,y} p_{y,w}.$$

Proposition 5.4. (a) *Assume that $L(s) > 0$ for all $s \in S$. If $x \leq w$, then*

$$p_{x,w} = v^{-L(w)+L(x)} \pmod{v^{-L(w)+L(x)+1} \mathbf{Z}[v]}.$$

(b) *Without assumption on L , for $x \leq w$ we have $p_{x,w} = v^{L(w)-L(x)} \mathbf{Z}[v^2, v^{-2}]$.*

We prove (a) by induction on $l(w) - l(x)$. If $l(w) - l(x) = 0$ then $x = w$, $p_{x,w} = 1$ and the result is obvious. Assume now that $l(w) - l(x) > 0$. Using 4.7(b) and the induction hypothesis, we see that $\sum_{y; x < y \leq w} r_{x,y} p_{y,w}$ is equal to

$$\sum_{y; x < y \leq w} \text{sgn}(x) \text{sgn}(y) v^{-L(y)+L(x)} v^{-L(w)+L(y)} = \sum_{y; x < y \leq w} \text{sgn}(x) \text{sgn}(y) v^{-L(w)+L(x)}$$

plus strictly higher powers of v . Using 4.8, we see that this is $-v^{-L(w)+L(x)}$ plus strictly higher powers of v .

$$\bar{p}_{x,w} - p_{x,w} = -v^{-L(w)+L(x)} \text{ plus strictly higher powers of } v.$$

Since $\bar{p}_{x,w} \in v \mathbf{Z}[v]$, it is in particular a $\mathbf{Z}$ -linear combination of powers of v strictly higher than $-L(w) + L(y)$. Hence

$$-p_{x,w} = -v^{-L(w)+L(x)} \text{ plus strictly higher powers of } v.$$

This proves (a).

We prove (b) by induction on $l(w) - l(x)$. If $l(w) - l(x) = 0$, then $x = w$, $p_{x,w} = 1$ and the result is obvious. Assume now that $l(w) - l(x) > 0$. Using 4.7(c) and the induction hypothesis, we see that

$$\sum_{y; x < y \leq w} r_{x,y} p_{y,w} \in \sum_{y; x < y \leq w} v^{L(y)-L(x)} v^{L(w)-L(y)} \mathbf{Z}[v^2, v^{-2}] = v^{L(w)-L(x)} \mathbf{Z}[v^2, v^{-2}].$$

Thus, $\bar{p}_{x,w} - p_{x,w} \in v^{L(w)-L(x)}\mathbf{Z}[v^2, v^{-2}]$. Hence $p_{x,w} \in v^{L(w)-L(x)}\mathbf{Z}[v^2, v^{-2}]$. The proposition is proved.

5.5. Let $s \in S$. From $T_s^{-1} = T_s - (v_s - v_s^{-1})$ we see that $r_{1,s} = v_s - v_s^{-1}$. We also see that

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{T_s + v_s^{-1}} &= T_s - (v_s - v_s^{-1}) + v_s = T_s + v_s^{-1}, \\ \overline{T_s - v_s} &= T_s - (v_s - v_s^{-1}) - v_s^{-1} = T_s - v_s.\end{aligned}$$

If $L(s) = 0$ we have $T_s^{-1} = T_s$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}c_s &= T_s + v_s^{-1} \text{ if } L(s) > 0, \\ c_s &= T_s - v_s \text{ if } L(s) < 0, \\ c_s &= T_s \text{ if } L(s) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

5.6. The involution in 3.4 carries T_w to $T_{w^{-1}}$ hence it carries $\mathcal{H}_{\leq 0}$ into itself; moreover, it commutes with $\bar{\cdot} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ (as pointed out in 4.9). Hence it carries c_w to $c_{w^{-1}}$ for any $w \in W$. It follows that

$$(a) \ p_{y^{-1}, w^{-1}} = p_{y, w}$$

for any $y, w \in W$.

6. LEFT OR RIGHT MULTIPLICATION BY c_s

6.1. In this section we fix $s \in S$. Assume first that $L(s) = 0$. In this case we have $c_s = T_s$; moreover, $T_s T_y = T_{sy}$. Hence for $w \in W$ we have

$$c_s c_w = \sum_y p_{y,w} T_s T_y = \sum_y p_{y,w} T_{sy} = \sum_y p_{sy,w} T_y.$$

We see that $c_s c_w \in \mathcal{H}_{\leq 0}$ and $c_s c_w = T_{sw} \pmod{\mathcal{H}_{< 0}}$. Since $\overline{c_s c_w} = c_s c_w$, it follows that, in this case, $c_s c_w = c_{sw}$. Similarly we have $c_w c_s = c_{ws}$.

6.2. In the remainder of this section (except in 6.8) we assume that $L(s) > 0$.

Proposition 6.3. *To any $y, w \in W$ such that $sy < y < w < sw$ one can assign uniquely an element $\mu_{y,w}^s \in \mathcal{A}$ so that*

$$\begin{aligned}(i) \quad & \bar{\mu}_{y,w}^s = \mu_{y,w}^s \text{ and} \\ (ii) \quad & \sum_{z; y \leq z < w; sz < z} p_{y,z} \mu_{z,w}^s - v_s p_{y,w} \in \mathcal{A}_{< 0}\end{aligned}$$

for any $y, w \in W$ such that $sy < y < w < sw$.

Let y, w be as above. We may assume that $\mu_{z,w}^s$ are already defined for all z such that $y < z < w; sz < z$. Then condition (ii) is of the form:

$$\mu_{y,w}^s \text{ equals a known element of } \mathcal{A} \text{ modulo } \mathcal{A}_{< 0}.$$

This condition determines uniquely the coefficients of v^n with $n \geq 0$ in $\mu_{y,w}^s$. Then condition (i) determines uniquely the coefficients of v^n with $n < 0$ in $\mu_{y,w}^s$. The proposition is proved.

Proposition 6.4. *Let $y, w \in W$ be such that $sy < y < w < sw$. Then $\mu_{y,w}^s$ is a $\mathbf{Z}$ -linear combination of powers v^n with $-L(s) + 1 \leq n \leq L(s) - 1$ and $n \equiv L(w) - L(y) - L(s) \pmod{2}$.*

We may assume that this is already known for all $\mu_{z,w}^s$ with z such that $y < z < w; sz < z$. Using 6.3(ii) and 5.4, we see that $\mu_{y,w}^s$ is a $\mathbf{Z}$ -linear combination

of powers v^n such that, whenever $n \geq 0$, we have $n \leq L(s) - 1$ and $n = L(w) - L(y) - L(s) \pmod{2}$. Using now 6.3(i), we deduce the remaining assertions of the proposition.

Corollary 6.5. *Assume that $L(s) = 1$. Let $y, w \in W$ be such that $sy < y < w < sw$. Then $\mu_{y,w}^s$ is an integer, equal to the coefficient of v^{-1} in $p_{y,w}$. In particular, it is 0 unless $L(w) - L(y)$ is odd.*

In this case, the inequalities of 6.4 become $0 \leq n \leq 0$. They imply $n = 0$. Thus, $\mu_{y,w}^s$ is an integer. Picking up the coefficient of v^0 in the two sides of 6.3(ii), we see that $\mu_{y,w}^s$ is equal to the coefficient of v^{-1} in $p_{y,w}$. The last assertion follows from 5.4.

Theorem 6.6. *Let $w \in W$.*

(a) *If $w < sw$, then $c_s c_w = c_{sw} + \sum_{z; sz < z < w} \mu_{z,w}^s c_z$.*

(b) *If $sw < w$, then $c_s c_w = (v_s + v_s^{-1}) c_w$.*

Since $c_s = T_s + v_s^{-1}$ (see 5.5), we see that (b) is equivalent to $(T_s - v_s) c_w = 0$, or to

(c) $p_{x,w} = v_s^{-1} p_{sx,w}$

(where $sw < w, x < sx$). We prove the theorem by induction on $l(w)$. If $w = 1$, the result is obvious. Assume now that $l(w) \geq 1$ and that the result holds when w is replaced by w' with $l(w') < l(w)$.

Case 1. Assume that $w < sw$. Using $c_s = T_s + v_s^{-1}$, we see that the coefficient of T_y in the left hand side minus the right hand side of (a) is

$$f_y = v_s^\sigma p_{y,w} + p_{sy,w} - p_{y,sw} - \sum_{z; y \leq z < w; sz < z} p_{y,z} \mu_{z,w}^s$$

where $\sigma = 1$ if $sy < y$ and $\sigma = -1$ if $sy > y$. We must show that $f_y = 0$. We first show that

(d) $f_y \in \mathcal{A}_{<0}$.

If $sy < y$ this follows from 6.3(ii). (The contribution of $p_{sy,w} - p_{y,sw}$ is in $\mathcal{A}_{<0}$ if $sy \neq w$ and is $1 - 1 = 0$ if $sy = w$.)

If $sy > y$ then, by (c) (applied to z in the sum, instead of w), we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_y &= v_s^{-1} p_{y,w} + p_{sy,w} - p_{y,sw} - \sum_{z; y \leq z < w; sz < z} v_s^{-1} p_{sy,z} \mu_{z,w}^s \\ &= v_s^{-1} f_{sy} + v_s^{-1} p_{sy,sw} - p_{y,sw} \end{aligned}$$

(the second equality holds by 2.5(a)) and this is in $\mathcal{A}_{<0}$ since $f_{sy} \in \mathcal{A}_{<0}$ (by the previous paragraph), $v_s^{-1} \in \mathcal{A}_{<0}$ and since $y \neq sw$. Thus, (d) is proved.

Since both sides of (a) are fixed by $\bar{\cdot}$, the sum $\sum_y f_y T_y$ is fixed by $\bar{\cdot}$. From (d) and 5.2(e) we see that $f_y = 0$ for all y , as required.

Case 2. Assume that $w > sw$. Then case 1 is applicable to sw (by the induction hypothesis). We see that

$c_w = (T_s + v_s^{-1})c_{sw} - \sum_{z; sz < z < sw} \mu_{z,sw}^s c_z$.
 Now $(T_s - v_s)(T_s + v_s^{-1}) = 0$ and $(T_s - v_s)c_z = 0$ for each z in the sum (by the induction hypothesis). Hence $(T_s - v_s)c_w = 0$. The theorem is proved.

Corollary 6.7. *Let $w \in W$.*

- (a) *If $w < ws$, then $c_w c_s = c_{ws} + \sum_{z; zs < z < w} \mu_{z^{-1},w^{-1}}^s c_z$.*
- (b) *If $ws < w$, then $c_w c_s = (v_s + v_s^{-1})c_w$.*

We write the equalities in 6.6(a),(b) for w^{-1} instead of w and we apply to these equalities the involution 3.4. Since this involution carries c_w to $c_{w^{-1}}$, the corollary follows.

6.8. 6.3, 6.6, 6.7 remain valid when $L(s) < 0$ provided that we replace in their statements and proofs v_s by $-v_s^{-1}$.

7. DIHEDRAL GROUPS

7.1. In this section we assume that S consists of two elements s_1, s_2 . For $i = 1, 2$, let $L_i = L(s_i), T_i = T_{s_i}, c_i = c_{s_i}$. We assume that $L_1 > 0, L_2 > 0$. Let $m = m_{s_1, s_2}$. Let $1_k, 2_k$ be as in 1.4. For $w \in W$ we set

$$\Gamma_w = \sum_{y; y \leq w} v^{-L(w)+L(y)} T_y.$$

Lemma 7.2. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 \Gamma_{2_k} &= \Gamma_{1_{k+1}} + v^{L_1 - L_2} \Gamma_{1_{k-1}} \text{ if } k \in [2, m), \\ c_2 \Gamma_{1_k} &= \Gamma_{2_{k+1}} + v^{-L_1 + L_2} \Gamma_{2_{k-1}} \text{ if } k \in [2, m), \\ c_1 \Gamma_{2_k} &= \Gamma_{1_{k+1}} \text{ if } k = 0, 1, \\ c_2 \Gamma_{1_k} &= \Gamma_{2_{k+1}} \text{ if } k = 0, 1. \end{aligned}$$

Since $c_i = T_i + v^{-L_i}$, the proof is an easy exercise.

Proposition 7.3. *Assume that $L_1 = L_2$. For any $w \in W$ we have $c_w = \Gamma_w$.*

This is clear when $l(w) \leq 1$. In the present case Lemma 7.2 gives

$$(c) \quad \Gamma_{1_{k+1}} = c_1 \Gamma_{2_k} - \Gamma_{1_{k-1}}, \quad \Gamma_{2_{k+1}} = c_2 \Gamma_{1_k} - \Gamma_{2_{k-1}}$$

for $k \in [1, m)$. This shows by induction on k that $\overline{\Gamma_w} = \Gamma_w$ for all $w \in W$. Clearly, $\Gamma_w = T_w \pmod{\mathcal{H}_{<0}}$. The lemma follows.

7.4. In 7.4-7.6 we assume that $L_2 > L_1$. In this case, if $m < \infty$, then m is even. (See 3.1.) For $2k+1 \in [1, m)$ we set

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma'_{2_{2k+1}} &= \sum_{s \in [0, k-1]} (1 - v^{2L_1} + v^{4L_1} - \dots + (-1)^s v^{2sL_1}) v^{-sL_1 - sL_2} \\ &\quad \times (T_{2_{2k-2s+1}} + v^{-L_2} T_{2_{2k-2s}} + v^{-L_2} T_{1_{2k-2s}} + v^{-2L_2} T_{1_{2k-2s-1}}) \\ &\quad + (1 - v^{2L_1} + v^{4L_1} - \dots + (-1)^k v^{2kL_1}) v^{-kL_1 - kL_2} (T_{2_1} + v^{-L_2} T_{2_0}). \end{aligned}$$

For $2k+1 \in [3, m)$ we set

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma'_{1_{2k+1}} &= T_{1_{2k+1}} + v^{-L_1} T_{1_{2k}} + v^{-L_1} T_{2_{2k}} + v^{-2L_1} T_{2_{2k-1}} + \sum_{\substack{y \\ y \leq 1_{2k-1}}} v^{-L(w)+L(y)} (1 + v^{2L_1}) T_y. \end{aligned}$$

For w such that $l(w)$ is even and for $w = 1_1$ we set $\Gamma'_w = \Gamma_w$.

Lemma 7.5. *Let $\zeta = v^{L_1-L_2} + v^{L_2-L_1} \in \mathcal{A}$. We have*

- (a) $c_1 \Gamma'_{2_{k'}} = \Gamma'_{1_{k'+1}}$, if $k' \in [0, m)$;
- (b) $c_2 \Gamma'_{1_{k'}} = \Gamma'_{2_{k'+1}} + \zeta \Gamma'_{2_{k'-1}} + \Gamma'_{2_{k'-3}}$, if $k' \in [4, m)$;
- (c) $c_2 \Gamma'_{1_{k'}} = \Gamma'_{2_{k'+1}} + \zeta \Gamma'_{2_{k'-1}}$, if $k' = 2, 3, k' < m$;
- (d) $c_2 \Gamma'_{1_{k'}} = \Gamma'_{2_{k'+1}}$ if $k' = 0, 1$.

From the definitions we have

- (e) $\Gamma'_{2_{2k+1}} = \sum_{s \in [0, k]} (-1)^s v^{s(L_1-L_2)} \Gamma_{2_{2k-2s+1}}$ if $2k+1 \in [1, m)$,
- (f) $\Gamma'_{1_{2k+1}} = \Gamma_{1_{2k+1}} + v^{L_1-L_2} \Gamma_{1_{2k-1}}$ if $2k+1 \in [3, m)$.

We prove (a) for $k' = 2k+1$. The left hand side can be computed using (e) and 7.2:

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 \Gamma'_{2_{2k+1}} &= c_1 (\Gamma_{2_{2k+1}} - v^{L_1-L_2} \Gamma_{2_{2k-1}} + v^{2L_1-2L_2} \Gamma_{2_{2k-3}} + \dots) \\ &= \Gamma_{1_{2k+2}} + v^{L_1-L_2} \Gamma_{1_{2k}} - v^{L_1-L_2} \Gamma_{1_{2k}} - v^{2L_1-2L_2} \Gamma_{1_{2k-2}} \\ &\quad + v^{2L_1-2L_2} \Gamma_{1_{2k-2}} - v^{3L_1-3L_2} \Gamma_{1_{2k-4}} + \dots = \Gamma_{1_{2k+2}} = \Gamma'_{1_{2k+2}}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves (a) for $k' = 2k+1$. Now (a) for $k' = 0$ is trivial. We prove (a) for $k' = 2k \geq 2$. The left hand side can be computed using 7.2 and (f):

$$c_1 \Gamma'_{2_{2k}} = c_1 \Gamma_{2_{2k}} = \Gamma_{1_{2k+1}} + v^{L_1-L_2} \Gamma_{1_{2k-1}} = \Gamma'_{1_{2k+1}}.$$

This proves (a) for $k' = 2k$. We prove (b) for $k' = 2k$. The left hand side can be computed using 7.2:

$$c_2 \Gamma'_{1_{2k}} = c_2 \Gamma_{1_{2k}} = \Gamma_{2_{2k+1}} + v^{-L_1+L_2} \Gamma_{2_{2k-1}}.$$

The right hand side of (b) is (using (e)):

$$\begin{aligned} &\Gamma_{2_{2k+1}} - v^{L_1-L_2} \Gamma_{2_{2k-1}} + v^{2L_1-2L_2} \Gamma_{2_{2k-3}} + \dots \\ &\quad + \zeta \Gamma_{2_{2k-1}} - v^{L_1-L_2} \zeta \Gamma_{2_{2k-3}} + v^{2L_1-2L_2} \zeta \Gamma_{2_{2k-5}} + \dots \\ &\quad + \Gamma_{2_{2k-3}} - v^{L_1-L_2} \Gamma_{2_{2k-5}} + v^{2L_1-2L_2} \Gamma_{2_{2k-7}} + \dots = \Gamma_{2_{2k+1}} + v^{-L_1+L_2} \Gamma_{2_{2k-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves (b) for $k' = 2k$. We prove (b) for $k' = 2k+1$. The left hand side can be computed using (f) and 7.2:

$$\begin{aligned} c_2 \Gamma'_{1_{2k+1}} &= c_2 (\Gamma_{1_{2k+1}} + v^{L_1-L_2} \Gamma_{1_{2k-1}}) \\ &= \Gamma_{2_{2k+2}} + v^{-L_1+L_2} \Gamma_{2_{2k}} + v^{L_1-L_2} \Gamma_{2_{2k}} + \Gamma_{2_{2k-2}} = \Gamma'_{2_{2k+2}} + \zeta \Gamma'_{2_{2k}} + \Gamma'_{2_{2k-2}}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves (b) for $k' = 2k+1$. The proof of (c),(d) is similar to that of (b). This completes the proof.

Proposition 7.6. *For any $w \in W$ we have $c_w = \Gamma'_w$.*

Clearly, $\Gamma'_w = T_w \pmod{\mathcal{H}_{<0}}$. From the formulas in 7.5 we see by induction on $l(w)$ that $\overline{\Gamma'_w} = \Gamma'_w$ for all w . The proposition is proved.

Proposition 7.7. *Assume that $m = \infty$. For $a \in \{1, 2\}$, let $f_a = v^{L(a)} + v^{-L(a)}$.*

(a) *Assume that $L_1 = L_2$. For $k, k' \geq 0$, we have*

$$c_{a_{2k+1}} c_{a_{2k'+1}} = f_a \sum_{u \in [0, \min(2k, 2k')]} c_{a_{2k+2k'+1-2u}}.$$

(b) *Assume that $L_2 > L_1$. For $k, k' \geq 0$, we have*

$$c_{2_{2k+1}} c_{2_{2k'+1}} = f_2 \sum_{u \in [0, \min(k, k')]} c_{2_{2k+2k'+1-4u}}.$$

(c) *Assume that $L_2 > L_1$. For $k, k' \geq 1$, we have*

$$c_{1_{2k+1}} c_{1_{2k'+1}} = f_1 \sum_{u \in [0, \min(k-1, k'-1)]} p_u c_{1_{2k+2k'+1-2u}}$$

where $p_u = \zeta$ for u odd, $p_u \in \mathbf{Z}$ for u even.

We prove (a). For $k = k' = 0$ the equality in (a) is clear. Assume now that $k = 0, k' \geq 1$. Using 7.2, 7.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_2 c_{2_{2k'+1}} &= c_2 (c_2 c_{1_{2k'}} - c_{2_{2k'-1}}) = f_2 c_2 c_{1_{2k'}} - f_2 c_{2_{2k'-1}} \\ &= f_2 c_{2_{2k'+1}} + f_2 c_{2_{2k'-1}} - f_2 c_{2_{2k'-1}} = f_2 c_{2_{2k'+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

as required. We now prove the equality in (a) for fixed k' , by induction on k . The case $k = 0$ is already known. Assume now that $k = 1$. From 7.2, 7.3 we have $c_{2_3} = c_2 c_1 c_2 - c_2$. Using this and 7.2, 7.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_{2_3} c_{2_{2k'+1}} &= c_2 c_1 c_2 c_{2_{2k'+1}} - c_2 c_{2_{2k'+1}} = f_2 c_2 c_{1_{2k'+2}} + f_2 c_2 c_{1_{2k'}} - f_2 c_{2_{2k'+1}} \\ &= f_2 c_{2_{2k'+3}} + f_2 c_{2_{2k'+1}} + f_2 c_{2_{2k'+1}} + (1 - \delta_{k',0}) f_2 c_{2_{2k'-1}} - f_2 c_{2_{2k'+1}} \\ &= f_2 c_{2_{2k'+3}} + f_2 c_{2_{2k'+1}} + f_2 (1 - \delta_{k',0}) c_{2_{2k'-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

as required. Assume now that $k \geq 2$. From 7.2, 7.3 we have

$$c_{2_{2k+1}} = c_2 c_1 c_{2_{2k-1}} - 2c_{2_{2k-1}} - c_{2_{2k-3}}.$$

Using this and the induction hypothesis we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_{2_{2k+1}} c_{2_{2k'+1}} &= c_2 c_1 c_{2_{2k-1}} c_{2_{2k'+1}} - 2c_{2_{2k-1}} c_{2_{2k'+1}} - c_{2_{2k-3}} c_{2_{2k'+1}} \\ &= f_2 c_1 c_2 \sum_{u \in [0, \min(2k-2, k')]} c_{2_{2k+2k'-1-2u}} - f_2 \sum_{u \in [0, \min(2k-2, k')]} c_{2_{2k+2k'-1-2u}} \\ &\quad - f_2 \sum_{u \in [0, \min(2k-4, k')]} c_{2_{2k+2k'-3-2u}}. \end{aligned}$$

We now use 7.2, 7.3 and (a) follows (for $a = 2$). The case $a = 1$ is similar.

We prove (b). For $k = k' = 0$ the equality in (b) is clear. Assume now that $k = 0, k' = 1$. Using 7.5, 7.6, we have

$$c_2 c_{2_3} = c_2 (c_2 c_{1_2} - \zeta c_{2_1}) = f_2 c_2 c_{1_2} - f_2 \zeta c_{2_1} = f_2 c_{2_3} + f_2 \zeta c_{2_1} - f_2 \zeta c_{2_1} = f_2 c_{2_3},$$

as required. Assume next that $k = 0, k' \geq 2$. Using 7.5, 7.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_2 c_{2_{2k'+1}} &= c_2 (c_2 c_{1_{2k'}} - \zeta c_{2_{2k'-1}} - c_{2_{2k'-3}}) = f_2 c_2 c_{1_{2k'}} - f_2 \zeta c_{2_{2k'-1}} - f_2 c_{2_{2k'-3}} \\ &= f_2 c_{2_{2k'+1}} + f_2 \zeta c_{2_{2k'-1}} + f_2 c_{2_{2k'-3}} - f_2 \zeta c_{2_{2k'-1}} - f_2 \zeta c_{2_{2k'-3}} = f_2 c_{2_{2k'+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

as required. We now prove the equality in (a) for fixed k' , by induction on k . The case $k = 0$ is already known. Assume now that $k = 1$. From 7.5, 7.6 we have $c_{2_3} = c_2 c_1 c_2 - \zeta c_2$. Using this and 7.5, 7.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_{2_3} c_{2_{2k'+1}} &= c_2 c_1 c_2 c_{2_{2k'+1}} - \zeta c_2 c_{2_{2k'+1}} = f_2 c_2 c_{1_{2k'+2}} - f_2 \zeta c_{2_{2k'+1}} \\ &= f_2 c_{2_{2k'+3}} + f_2 \zeta c_{2_{2k'+1}} + (1 - \delta_{k',0}) f_2 c_{2_{2k'-1}} - f_2 \zeta c_{2_{2k'+1}} \\ &= f_2 c_{2_{2k'+3}} + (1 - \delta_{k',0}) f_2 c_{2_{2k'-1}} \end{aligned}$$

as required. Assume now that $k \geq 2$. From 7.5, 7.6 we have

$$c_{2_{2k+1}} = c_2 c_1 c_{2_{2k-1}} - \zeta c_{2_{2k-1}} - c_{2_{2k-3}}.$$

Using this and the induction hypothesis we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_{2_{2k+1}} c_{2_{2k'+1}} &= c_2 c_1 c_{2_{2k-1}} c_{2_{2k'+1}} - \zeta c_{2_{2k-1}} c_{2_{2k'+1}} - c_{2_{2k-3}} c_{2_{2k'+1}} \\ &= f_2 c_2 c_1 \sum_{u \in [0, \min(k-1, k')]} c_{2_{2k+2k'-1-4u}} - f_2 \zeta \sum_{u \in [0, \min(k-1, k')]} c_{2_{2k+2k'-1-4u}} \\ &\quad - f_2 \sum_{u \in [0, \min(k-2, k')]} c_{2_{2k+2k'-3-4u}}. \end{aligned}$$

We now use 7.5, 7.6 and (b) follows.

The proof of (c) is similar to that of (b). This completes the proof.

Proposition 7.8. *Assume that $4 \leq m < \infty$ and $L_2 > L_1$. Then $m = 2k + 2$ with $k \geq 1$. Let*

$$p = (-1)^k (v^{L_2} + v^{-L_2}) (v^{k(L_2-L_1)} + v^{(k-2)(L_2-L_1)} + \dots + v^{-k(L_2-L_1)}).$$

Then, for some $q \in \mathcal{A}$, we have

$$(a) \quad c_{2_{m-1}} c_{2_{m-1}} = p c_{2_{m-1}} + q c_{2_m}.$$

From 7.5, 7.6, we see that $\mathcal{A} c_{2_{m-1}} + \mathcal{A} c_{2_m}$ is a two-sided ideal of $\mathcal{H}$. Hence (a) holds for some (unknown) $p, q \in \mathcal{A}$. It remains to compute p . Let $\chi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be the algebra homomorphism defined by $\chi(T_1) = -v^{-L_1}, \chi(T_2) = v^{L_2}$. Since $c_{2_m} = (T_1 + v^{-L_1})h$ for some $h \in \mathcal{H}$ (see 7.5, 7.6) we see that $\chi(c_{2_m}) = 0$. Hence applying χ to (a) gives $\chi(c_{2_{m-1}})^2 = p \chi(c_{2_{m-1}})$. It is thus enough to show that

(b) $\chi(c_{2m-1}) = p$.

We verify (b) for $m = 4$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \chi(T_2 T_1 T_2 + v^{-L_2} T_2 T_1 + v^{-L_2} T_1 T_2 + v^{-2L_2} T_1 \\
& + (v^{-L_1-L_2} - v^{L_1-L_2}) T_2 + (v^{-L_1-2L_2} - v^{L_1-2L_2})) \\
& = -v^{-L_1+2L_2} - 2v^{-L_1} - v^{-L_1-2L_2} + (v^{-L_1-L_2} - v^{L_1-L_2}) v^{L_2} \\
& + v^{-L_1-2L_2} - v^{L_1-2L_2} = -v^{-L_1+2L_2} - v^{-L_1} - v^{L_1} - v^{L_1-2L_2}
\end{aligned}$$

and for $m = 6$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \chi(T_2 T_1 T_2 T_1 T_2 + v^{-L_2} T_2 T_1 T_2 T_1 + v^{-L_2} T_1 T_2 T_1 T_2 + v^{-2L_2} T_1 T_2 T_1 \\
& + (v^{-L_1-L_2} - v^{L_1-L_2}) T_2 T_1 T_2 + (v^{-L_1-2L_2} - v^{L_1-2L_2}) T_1 T_2 \\
& + (v^{-L_1-2L_2} - v^{L_1-2L_2}) T_2 T_1 + (v^{-L_1-3L_2} - v^{L_1-3L_2}) T_1 \\
& + (v^{-2L_1-2L_2} - v^{-2L_2} + v^{2L_1-2L_2}) T_2 + (v^{-2L_1-3L_2} - v^{-3L_2} + v^{2L_1-3L_2})) \\
& = v^{-2L_1+3L_2} + 2v^{-2L_1+L_2} + v^{-2L_1-L_2} - v^{-2L_1+L_2} - 2v^{-2L_1-L_2} - v^{-2L_1-3L_2} + v^{L_2} \\
& + 2v^{-L_2} + v^{-3L_2} + v^{-2L_1-L_2} - v^{-L_2} + v^{2L_1-L_2} + v^{-2L_1-3L_2} - v^{-3L_2} + v^{2L_1-3L_2} \\
& = v^{-2L_1+3L_2} + v^{-2L_1+L_2} + v^{L_2} + v^{-L_2} + v^{2L_1-L_2} + v^{2L_1-3L_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Analogous computations can be carried out for any even m . The proposition is proved. ■

8. CELLS

8.1. For $z \in W$ define $D_z \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{A})$ by

$$D_z(c_w) = \delta_{z,w} \text{ for all } w \in W.$$

If $w, w' \in W$ we write $w \leftarrow_{\mathcal{L}} w'$ or $w' \rightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} w$ if there exists $s \in S$ such that $D_w(c_s c_{w'}) \neq 0$; we write $w \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R}} w'$ or $w' \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} w$ if there exists $s \in S$ such that $D_w(c_{w'} c_s) \neq 0$; we write $w \leftarrow_{\mathcal{LR}} w'$ or $w' \rightarrow_{\mathcal{LR}} w$ if there exists $s \in S$ such that $D_w(c_s c_{w'}) \neq 0$ or $D_w(c_{w'} c_s) \neq 0$.

If $w, w' \in W$, we say that $w \leq_{\mathcal{L}} w'$ (resp. $w \leq_{\mathcal{R}} w'$) if there exists a sequence $w = w_0, w_1, \dots, w_n = w'$ in W such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& w_0 \leftarrow_{\mathcal{L}} w_1, w_1 \leftarrow_{\mathcal{L}} w_2, \dots, w_{n-1} \leftarrow_{\mathcal{L}} w_n \\
& \text{(resp. } w_0 \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R}} w_1, w_1 \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R}} w_2, \dots, w_{n-1} \leftarrow_{\mathcal{R}} w_n).
\end{aligned}$$

If $w, w' \in W$, we say that $w \leq_{\mathcal{LR}} w'$ if there exists a sequence

$$w = w_0, w_1, \dots, w_n = w'$$

in W such that

$$w_0 \leftarrow_{\mathcal{LR}} w_1, w_1 \leftarrow_{\mathcal{LR}} w_2, \dots, w_{n-1} \leftarrow_{\mathcal{LR}} w_n.$$

Clearly $\leq_{\mathcal{L}}, \leq_{\mathcal{R}}, \leq_{\mathcal{LR}}$ are preorders on W . Let $\sim_{\mathcal{L}}, \sim_{\mathcal{R}}, \sim_{\mathcal{LR}}$ be the associated equivalence relations. (For example, we have $w \sim_{\mathcal{L}} w'$ if and only if $w \leq_{\mathcal{L}} w'$ and $w' \leq_{\mathcal{L}} w$.) The equivalence classes on W for $\sim_{\mathcal{L}}, \sim_{\mathcal{R}}, \sim_{\mathcal{LR}}$ are called respectively *left cells*, *right cells*, *two-sided cells* of W . They depend on $L : W \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$.

If $w, w' \in W$, we say that $w <_{\mathcal{L}} w'$ (resp. $w <_{\mathcal{R}} w'$; $w <_{\mathcal{LR}} w'$) if $w \leq_{\mathcal{L}} w'$ and $w \not\sim_{\mathcal{L}} w'$ (resp. $w <_{\mathcal{R}} w'$ and $w \not\sim_{\mathcal{R}} w'$; $w <_{\mathcal{LR}} w'$ and $w \not\sim_{\mathcal{LR}} w'$).

Let $w, w' \in W$. It is clear that

$$w \leq_{\mathcal{L}} w' \text{ if and only if } w^{-1} \leq_{\mathcal{R}} w'^{-1},$$

$$w \leq_{\mathcal{LR}} w' \text{ if and only if } w^{-1} \leq_{\mathcal{LR}} w'^{-1}.$$

It follows that $w \mapsto w^{-1}$ carries left cells to right cells, right cells to left cells and two-sided cells to two-sided cells.

Lemma 8.2. *Let $w' \in W$.*

- (a) $\mathcal{H}_{\leq_{\mathcal{L}} w'} = \oplus_{w; w \leq_{\mathcal{L}} w'} \mathcal{A}c_w$ is a left ideal of $\mathcal{H}$.
- (b) $\mathcal{H}_{\leq_{\mathcal{R}} w'} = \oplus_{w; w \leq_{\mathcal{R}} w'} \mathcal{A}c_w$ is a right ideal of $\mathcal{H}$.
- (c) $\mathcal{H}_{\leq_{\mathcal{LR}} w'} = \oplus_{w; w \leq_{\mathcal{LR}} w'} \mathcal{A}c_w$ is a two-sided ideal of $\mathcal{H}$.

We prove (a). Since $c_s (s \in S)$ generate $\mathcal{H}$ as an $\mathcal{A}$ -algebra, it is enough to verify the following statement:

if $w \in W$ is such that $w \leq_{\mathcal{L}} w'$ and $s \in S$ then $c_s c_w \in \mathcal{H}_{\leq_{\mathcal{L}} w'}$.

From the definition, $c_s c_w$ is an $\mathcal{A}$ -linear combination of elements $c_{w''}$ with $w'' \leftarrow_{\mathcal{L}} w$. For such w'' we clearly have $w'' \leq_{\mathcal{L}} w'$. This proves (a). The proof of (b), (c) is entirely similar.

8.3. Let Y be a left cell of W . From 8.3(a) we see that for $y \in Y$,

$$\oplus_{w; w \leq_{\mathcal{L}} y} \mathcal{A}c_w / \oplus_{w; w <_{\mathcal{L}} y} \mathcal{A}c_w$$

is a quotient of two left ideals of $\mathcal{H}$ (independent of the choice of y) hence it is naturally a left $\mathcal{H}$ -module; it has an $\mathcal{A}$ -basis consisting of the images of $c_w (w \in Y)$.

Similarly, if Y' is a right cell of W then, for $y' \in Y'$,

$$\oplus_{w; w \leq_{\mathcal{R}} y'} \mathcal{A}c_w / \oplus_{w; w <_{\mathcal{R}} y'} \mathcal{A}c_w$$

is a quotient of two right ideals of $\mathcal{H}$ (independent of the choice of y') hence it is naturally a right $\mathcal{H}$ -module; it has an $\mathcal{A}$ -basis consisting of the images of $c_w (w \in Y')$.

If Y'' is a two-sided cell of W then, for $y'' \in Y''$,

$$\oplus_{w; w \leq_{\mathcal{LR}} y''} \mathcal{A}c_w / \oplus_{w; w <_{\mathcal{LR}} y''} \mathcal{A}c_w$$

is a quotient of two two-sided ideals of $\mathcal{H}$ (independent of the choice of y'') hence it is naturally a $\mathcal{H}$ -bimodule; it has an $\mathcal{A}$ -basis consisting of the images of $c_w (w \in Y'')$.

Lemma 8.4. *Let $s \in S$. Assume that $L(s) > 0$. Let $\mathcal{H}^s = \oplus_{w; sw < w} \mathcal{A}c_w$, ${}^s\mathcal{H}^s = \oplus_{w; ws < w} \mathcal{A}c_w$.*

- (a) $\{h \in \mathcal{H} | (c_s - v_s - v_s^{-1})h = 0\} = \mathcal{H}^s$. Hence $\mathcal{H}^s$ is a right ideal of $\mathcal{H}$.
- (b) $\{h \in \mathcal{H} | h(c_s - v_s - v_s^{-1}) = 0\} = {}^s\mathcal{H}$. Hence ${}^s\mathcal{H}$ is a left ideal of $\mathcal{H}$.

We prove the equality in (a). The right hand side is contained in the left hand side by 6.6(b). Conversely, by 6.6, we have $c_s h \in \mathcal{H}^s$ for any $h \in \mathcal{H}$. Hence, if $h \in \mathcal{H}$ is such that $c_s h = (v_s + v_s^{-1})h$, then $(v_s + v_s^{-1})h \in \mathcal{H}^s$ so that $h \in \mathcal{H}^s$ (since $\mathcal{H}/\mathcal{H}^s$ is a free $\mathcal{A}$ -module). This proves (a). The proof of (b) is entirely similar. The lemma is proved.

8.5. For $w \in W$ we set $\mathcal{L}(w) = \{s \in S | sw < w\}$, $\mathcal{R}(w) = \{s \in S | ws < w\}$.

Lemma 8.6. *Let $w, w' \in W$. Assume that $L(s) > 0$ for all $s \in S$.*

- (a) *If $w \leq_{\mathcal{L}} w'$, then $\mathcal{R}(w') \subset \mathcal{R}(w)$. If $w \sim_{\mathcal{L}} w'$, then $\mathcal{R}(w') = \mathcal{R}(w)$.*
(b) *If $w \leq_{\mathcal{R}} w'$, then $\mathcal{L}(w') \subset \mathcal{L}(w)$. If $w \sim_{\mathcal{R}} w'$, then $\mathcal{L}(w') = \mathcal{L}(w)$.*

To prove the first assertion of (a), we may assume that $D_w(c_s c_{w'}) \neq 0$ for some $s \in S$. Let $t \in \mathcal{R}(w')$. We must prove that $t \in \mathcal{R}(w)$. We have $c_{w'} \in {}^t\mathcal{H}$. By 8.4, ${}^t\mathcal{H}$ is a left ideal of $\mathcal{H}$. Hence $c_s c_{w'} \in {}^t\mathcal{H}$. By the definition of ${}^t\mathcal{H}$, for $h \in {}^t\mathcal{H}$ we have $D_w(h) = 0$ unless $wt < w$. Hence from $D_w(c_s c_{w'}) \neq 0$ we deduce $wt < w$, as required. This proves the first assertion of (a). The second assertion of (a) follows immediately from the first. The proof of (b) is entirely similar to that of (a). The lemma is proved.

8.7. We describe the left cells of W in the setup of 7.3. From 7.2 and 7.3 we can determine all pairs $y \neq w$ such that $y \leftarrow w$ (we write $\leftarrow, \rightarrow$ instead of $\leftarrow_{\mathcal{L}}, \rightarrow_{\mathcal{L}}$):

$$\begin{aligned} 1_0 \rightarrow 2_1 &\leftrightsquigarrow 1_2 \leftrightsquigarrow 2_3 \leftrightsquigarrow \dots, \\ 2_0 \rightarrow 1_1 &\leftrightsquigarrow 2_2 \leftrightsquigarrow 1_3 \leftrightsquigarrow \dots, \end{aligned}$$

if $m = \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} 1_0 \rightarrow 2_1 &\leftrightsquigarrow 1_2 \leftrightsquigarrow 2_3 \leftrightsquigarrow \dots \leftrightsquigarrow 2_{m-1} \rightarrow 1_m, \\ 2_0 \rightarrow 1_1 &\leftrightsquigarrow 2_2 \leftrightsquigarrow 1_3 \leftrightsquigarrow \dots \leftrightsquigarrow 1_{m-1} \rightarrow 2_m, \end{aligned}$$

if $m < \infty, m$ even,

$$\begin{aligned} 1_0 \rightarrow 2_1 &\leftrightsquigarrow 1_2 \leftrightsquigarrow 2_3 \leftrightsquigarrow \dots \leftrightsquigarrow 1_{m-1} \rightarrow 2_m, \\ 2_0 \rightarrow 1_1 &\leftrightsquigarrow 2_2 \leftrightsquigarrow 1_3 \leftrightsquigarrow \dots \leftrightsquigarrow 2_{m-1} \rightarrow 1_m, \end{aligned}$$

if $m < \infty, m$ odd. Hence the left cells are

$$\{1_0\}, \{2_1, 1_2, 2_3, \dots\}, \{1_1, 2_2, 1_3, \dots\},$$

if $m = \infty$,

$$\{1_0\}, \{2_1, 1_2, 2_3, \dots, 2_{m-1}\}, \{1_1, 2_2, 1_3, \dots, 1_{m-1}\}, \{2_m\},$$

if $m < \infty, m$ even,

$$\{1_0\}, \{2_1, 1_2, 2_3, \dots, 1_{m-1}\}, \{1_1, 2_2, 1_3, \dots, 2_{m-1}\}, \{2_m\},$$

if $m < \infty, m$ odd.

The two-sided cells are $\{1_0\}, W - \{1_0\}$ if $m = \infty$ and $\{1_0\}, \{2_m\}, W - \{1_0, 2_m\}$ if $m < \infty$.

8.8. We describe the left cells of W in the setup of 7.4. From 7.5 and 7.6 we can determine all pairs $y \neq w$ such that $y \leftarrow w$ (we write $\leftarrow, \rightarrow$ instead of $\leftarrow_{\mathcal{L}}, \rightarrow_{\mathcal{L}}$).

If $m = \infty$, these pairs are:

$$1_0 \rightarrow 2_1 \leftrightsquigarrow 1_2 \rightarrow 2_3 \leftrightsquigarrow 1_4 \rightarrow \dots, \quad 2_0 \rightarrow 1_1 \rightarrow 2_2 \leftrightsquigarrow 1_3 \rightarrow 2_4 \leftrightsquigarrow \dots,$$

and $2_1 \leftarrow 1_4, 2_2 \leftarrow 1_5, 2_3 \leftarrow 1_6, \dots$

If $m = 4$, these pairs are:

$$1_0 \rightarrow 2_1 \leftrightsquigarrow 1_2 \rightarrow 2_3 \rightarrow 1_4, \quad 2_0 \rightarrow 1_1 \rightarrow 2_2 \leftrightsquigarrow 1_3 \rightarrow 2_4.$$

If $m = 6$, these pairs are:

$$1_0 \rightarrow 2_1 \leftrightsquigarrow 1_2 \rightarrow 2_3 \leftrightsquigarrow 1_4 \rightarrow 2_5 \rightarrow 1_6, \quad 2_0 \rightarrow 1_1 \rightarrow 2_2 \leftrightsquigarrow 1_3 \rightarrow 2_4 \leftrightsquigarrow 1_5 \rightarrow 2_6,$$

and $2_1 \leftarrow 1_4, 2_2 \leftarrow 1_5$. An analogous pattern holds for any even m .

Hence the left cells are

$$\{1_0\}, \{2_1, 1_2, 2_3, 1_4, \dots\}, \{1_1\}, \{2_2, 1_3, 2_4, 1_5, \dots\},$$

if $m = \infty$,

$\{1_0\}, \{2_1, 1_2, 2_3, \dots, 1_{m-2}\}, \{2_{m-1}\}, \{1_1\}, \{2_2, 1_3, 2_4, \dots, 1_{m-1}\}, \{2_m\},$
if $m < \infty$.

The two-sided cells are

$\{1_0\}, \{1_1\}, W - \{1_0, 1_1\}$, if $m = \infty$ and

$\{1_0\}, \{1_1\}, \{2_{m-1}\}, \{2_m\}, W - \{1_0, 1_1, 2_{m-1}, 2_m\}$, if $m < \infty$.

9. COSETS OF PARABOLIC SUBGROUPS

Lemma 9.1. *Assume that $w = s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ with $s_i \in S$. We can find a subsequence $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_r$ of $1, 2, \dots, r$ such that $w = s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \dots s_{i_r}$ is a reduced expression.*

We argue by induction on q . If $q = 0$ the result is obvious. Assume that $q > 0$. Using the induction hypothesis we can assume that $s_2 \dots s_q$ is a reduced expression. If $s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ is a reduced expression, we are done. Hence we may assume that $s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ is not a reduced expression. Then $l(w) = q - 1$. By 1.7, we can find $j \in [2, q]$ such that $s_1 s_2 \dots s_{j-1} = s_2 s_3 \dots s_j$. Then $w = s_2 s_3 \dots s_{j-1} s_{j+1} \dots s_q$ is a reduced expression. The lemma is proved.

9.2. Let $w \in W$. Let $w = s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ be a reduced expression of w . Using 1.9, we see that the set $\{s \in S \mid s = s_i \text{ for some } i \in [1, q]\}$ is independent of the choice of reduced expression. We denote it by S_w .

9.3. In the remainder of this section we fix $I \subset S$. Let W_I be the subgroup of W generated by I .

If $w \in W_I$ then we can find a reduced expression $w = s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ in W with all $s_i \in I$ (we first write $w = s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ a not necessarily reduced expression with all $s_i \in I$ and then we apply 9.1). Thus, $S_w \subset I$. Conversely, it is clear that if $w' \in W$ satisfies $S_{w'} \subset I$ then $w' \in W_I$. It follows that

$$W_I = \{w \in W \mid S_w \subset I\}.$$

9.4. Replacing $S, (m_{s,s'})_{(s,s') \in S \times S}$ by $I, (m_{s,s'})_{(s,s') \in I \times I}$ in the definition of W we obtain a Coxeter group denoted by W_I^* . We have an obvious homomorphism $f : W_I^* \rightarrow W_I$ which takes s to s for $s \in I$.

Proposition 9.5. *$f : W_I^* \rightarrow W_I$ is an isomorphism.*

We define $f' : W_I \rightarrow W_I^*$ as follows: for $w \in W_I$ we choose a reduced expression $w = s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ in W ; then $s_i \in I$ for all i (see 9.3) and we set $f'(w) = s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ (product in W_I^*). This map is well defined. Indeed, if $s'_1 s'_2 \dots s'_q$ is another reduced expression for w with all $s_i \in I$, then we can pass from $(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_q)$ to $(s'_1, s'_2, \dots, s'_q)$ by moving along edges of the graph X (see 1.9); but each edge involved in this move will necessarily involve only pairs (s, s') in I , hence the equation $s_1 s_2 \dots s_q = s'_1 s'_2 \dots s'_q$ must hold in W_I^* . It is clear that $f f'(w) = w$ for all $w \in W_I$. Hence f' is injective.

We show that f' is a group homomorphism. It suffices to show that $f'(sw) = f'(s)f'(w)$ for any $w \in W_I, s \in I$. This is clear if $l(sw) = l(w) + 1$ (in W). Assume now that $l(sw) = l(w) - 1$ (in W). Let $w = s_1 s_2 \dots s_r$ be a reduced expression in

W . Then $s_i \in I$ for all i . By 1.7 we have (in W) $sw = s_1 s_2 \dots s_{i-1} s_{i+1} \dots s_q$ for some $i \in [1, q]$. Since $ss_1 s_2 \dots s_{i-1} s_{i+1} \dots s_q$ is a reduced expression for w in W , we have $f'(w) = ss_1 s_2 \dots s_{i-1} s_{i+1} \dots s_q$ (product in W_I^*). We also have $f'(w) = s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ (product in W_I^*). Hence $ss_1 s_2 \dots s_{i-1} s_{i+1} \dots s_q = s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ (in W_I^*). Hence $s_1 s_2 \dots s_{i-1} s_{i+1} \dots s_q = ss_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ (in W_I^*). Hence $f'(sw) = f'(s)f'(w)$, as required.

Since the image of f' contains the generators $s \in I$ of W_I^* and f' is a group homomorphism, it follows that f' is surjective. Hence f' is bijective. Since $ff' = 1$ it follows that f is bijective. The proposition is proved.

9.6. We identify W_I^* and W_I via f . Thus, W_I is naturally a Coxeter group. Let $l_I : W_I \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ be the length function of this Coxeter group. Let $w \in W_I$. Let $w = s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ be a reduced expression of w (in W). Then $s_i \in I$ for all i (see 9.3). Hence $l_I(w) \leq l(w)$. The reverse inequality $l(w) \leq l_I(w)$ is obvious. Hence $l_I(w) = l(w)$.

From 2.4 we see that the partial order on W_I defined in the same way as $\leq$ on W is just the restriction of $\leq$ from W to W_I .

Lemma 9.7. *Let $W_I a$ be a coset in W .*

- (a) *This coset has a unique element w of minimal length.*
- (b) *If $y \in W_I$ then $l(yw) = l(y) + l(w)$.*
- (c) *w is characterized by the property that $l(sw) > l(w)$ for all $s \in I$.*

Let w be an element of minimal length in the coset. Let $w = s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ be a reduced expression. Let $y \in W_I$ and let $y = s'_1 s'_2 \dots s'_p$ be a reduced expression in W_I . Then $yw = s'_1 s'_2 \dots s'_p s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$. By 9.1 we can drop some of the factors in the last product so that we are left with a reduced expression for yw . The factors dropped cannot contain any among the last q since we would find an element in $W_I a$ of strictly smaller length than w . Thus, we can find a subsequence $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_r$ of $1, 2, \dots, p$ such that $yw = s'_{i_1} s'_{i_2} \dots s'_{i_r} s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ is a reduced expression. It follows that $y = s'_1 s'_2 \dots s'_p = s'_{i_1} s'_{i_2} \dots s'_{i_r}$. Since $p = l(y)$, we must have $r = p$ so that $s'_1 s'_2 \dots s'_p s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ is a reduced expression and $l(yw) = p + q = l(y) + l(w)$.

If now w' is another element of minimal length in $W_I a$ then $w' = yw$ for some $y \in W_I$. We have $l(w) = l(w') = l(y) + l(w)$ hence $l(y) = 0$ hence $y = 1$ and $w' = w$. This proves (a). Now (b) is already proved. Note that by (b), w has the property in (c). Conversely, let $w' \in aW_I$ be an element such that $l(sw') > l(w')$ for all $s \in I$. We have $w' = yw$ for some $y \in W_I$. If $y \neq 1$ then for some $s \in I$ we have $l(y) = l(sy) + 1$. By (b) we have $l(w') = l(y) + l(w)$, $l(sw') = l(sy) + l(w)$. Thus $l(w') - l(sw') = l(y) - l(sy) = 1$, a contradiction. Thus $y = 1$ and $w' = w$. The lemma is proved.

Lemma 9.8. *Let $W_I a$ be a coset in W .*

- (a) *If W_I is finite, this coset has a unique element w of maximal length. If W_I is infinite, this coset has no element of maximal length.*
- (b) *Assume that W_I is finite. If $y \in W_I$ then $l(yw) = l(w) - l(y)$.*

(c) Assume that W_I is finite. Then w is characterized by the property that $l(sw) < l(w)$ for all $s \in I$.

Assume that w has maximal length in $W_I a$. We show that for any $y \in W_I$ we have

$$(d) \quad l(yw) = l(w) - l(y).$$

We argue by induction on $l(y)$. If $l(y) = 0$, the result is clear. Assume now that $l(y) = p + 1 \geq 1$. Let $y = s_1 \dots s_p s_{p+1}$ be a reduced expression. By the induction hypothesis, $l(w) = l(s_1 s_2 \dots s_p w) + p$. Hence we can find a reduced expression of w of the form $s_p \dots s_2 s_1 s'_1 s'_2 \dots s'_q$. Since $s_{p+1} \in I$, by our assumption on w we have $l(s_{p+1}w) = l(w) - 1$. Using 1.7, we deduce that either

- (1) $s_{p+1} s_p \dots s_{j+1} = s_p \dots s_{j+1} s_j$ for some $j \in [1, p]$ or
- (2) $s_{p+1} s_p \dots s_2 s_1 s'_1 s'_2 \dots s'_{i+1} = s_p \dots s_2 s_1 s'_1 s'_2 \dots s'_{i+1} s'_i$ for some $i \in [1, q]$.

In case (1) it follows that $y = s_1 \dots s_p s_{p+1} = s_1 s_2 \dots s_{j-1} s_{j+1} \dots s_p$ contradicting $l(y) = p + 1$. Thus, we must be in case (2). We have

$$yw = s'_1 s'_2 \dots s'_{i-1} s'_{i+1} \dots s'_q \text{ and } l(yw) \leq q - 1 = l(w) - p - 1 = l(w) - l(y).$$

Thus, $l(w) \geq l(yw) + l(y)$. The reverse inequality is obvious. Hence $l(w) = l(yw) + l(y)$. This completes the induction.

From (d) we see that $l(y) \leq l(w)$. Thus $l : W_I \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ is bounded above. Hence there exists $y \in W_I$ of maximal length in W_I . Applying (d) to y, W_I instead of $w, W_I a$ we see that

$$l(y) = l(y'^{-1}) + l(y'^{-1}y) = l(y') + l(y'^{-1}y)$$

for any $y' \in W_I$. Hence a reduced expression of y' followed by a reduced expression of $y'^{-1}y$ gives a reduced expression of y . In particular $y' \leq y$. Since the set $\{y' \in W_I | y' \leq y\}$ is finite, we see that W_I is finite. Conversely, if W_I is finite then $W_I a$ clearly has some element of maximal length.

If w' is another element of maximal length in aW_I then $w' = yw$ for some $y \in W_I$. We have $l(w) = l(w') = l(w) - l(y)$ hence $l(y) = 0$ hence $y = 1$ and $w' = w$. This proves (a) and (b). The proof of (c) is entirely similar to that of 9.7(c). The lemma is proved.

9.9. Replacing W, L by $W_I, L|_{W_I}$ in the definition of $\mathcal{H}$ we obtain an $\mathcal{A}$ -algebra $\mathcal{H}_I$ (naturally a subalgebra of $\mathcal{H}$); instead of $r_{x,y}, p_{x,y}, c_y, \mu_{x,y}^s$ we obtain for $x, y \in W_I$ elements $r_{x,y}^I \in \mathcal{A}, p_{x,y}^I \in \mathcal{A}_{\leq 0}, c_y^I \in \mathcal{H}_I, \mu_{x,y}^{s,I} \in \mathcal{A}$.

Lemma 9.10. *Let $z \in W$ be such that z is the element of minimal length of $W_I z$.*

Let $x, y \in W_I$. We have

- (a) $\{u' \in W | xz \leq u' \leq yz\} = \{u \in W_I | x \leq u \leq y\}z$;
- (b) $r_{xz,yz} = r_{x,y}^I$;
- (c) $p_{xz,yz} = p_{x,y}^I$;
- (d) $c_y^I = c_y$.
- (e) *If in addition, $s \in I$ and $sx < x < y < sy$, then $sxz < xz < yz < syz$ and $\mu_{x,y}^{s,I} = \mu_{xz,yz}^s$.*

We first prove the following statement.

Assume that z_1, z_2 have minimal length in $W_I z_1, W_I z_2$ respectively, that $u_1, u_2 \in W_I$ and that $u_1 z_1 \leq u_2 z_2$. Then

(f) $z_1 \leq z_2$; if in addition, $z_1 = z_2$ then $u_1 \leq u_2$.

Indeed, using 2.4 we see that there exist u'_1, z'_1 such that

$$u_1 z_1 = u'_1 z'_1, u'_1 \leq u_2, z'_1 \leq z_2.$$

Then $u'_1 \in W_I$ and $z'_1 \in W_I z_1$ hence $z'_1 = w z_1$ where $w \in W_I$, $l(z'_1) = l(w) + l(z_1)$. Hence $z_1 \leq z'_1$. Since $z'_1 \leq z_2$, we see that $z_1 \leq z_2$. If we know that $z_1 = z_2$, then $z'_1 = z_1$ hence $u_1 = u'_1$. Since $u'_1 \leq u_2$, it follows that $u_1 \leq u_2$ and (f) is proved.

We prove (a). If $u \in W_I$ and $x \leq u \leq y$, then $xz \leq uz \leq yz$ by 2.4 and 9.7(b). Conversely, assume that $u' \in W$ satisfies $xz \leq u' \leq yz$. Then $u' = uz_1$ where z_1 has minimal length in $W_I u'$ and $u \in W_I$. Applying (f) to $xz \leq uz_1$ and to $uz_1 \leq yz$ we deduce $z \leq z_1 \leq z$. Hence $z = z_1$. Applying the second part of (f) to $xz \leq uz$ and to $uz \leq yz$ we deduce $x \leq u \leq y$. This proves (a).

We prove (b) by induction on $l(y)$. Assume first that $y = 1$. Then $r_{x,y}^I = \delta_{x,1}$. Now $r_{xz,z} = 0$ unless $xz \leq z$ (see 4.7(a)) in which case $x = 1$ and $r_{z,z} = 1$. Thus, (b) holds for $y = 1$. Assume now that $l(y) \geq 1$. We can find $s \in I$ such that $l(sy) = l(y) - 1$. We have

$$l(syz) = l(sy) + l(z) = l(y) - 1 + l(z) = l(yz) - 1.$$

If $sx < x$ then we have (as in the previous line) $sxz < xz$. Using 4.4 and the induction hypothesis, we have

$$r_{xz,yz} = r_{sxz,syz} = r_{sx,sy}^I = r_{x,y}^I.$$

If $sx > x$ then we have (as above) $sxz > xz$. Using 4.4 and the induction hypothesis, we have

$$r_{xz,yz} = r_{sxz,syz} + (v_s - v_s^{-1})r_{xz,syz} = r_{sx,sy}^I + (v_s - v_s^{-1})r_{x,sy}^I = r_{x,y}^I.$$

This completes the proof of (b).

We prove (c). Using (a), we may assume that $x \leq y$ (otherwise, both sides are zero.) We argue by induction on $l(y) - l(x) \geq 0$. If $y = x$, the result is clear (both sides are 1). Assume now that $l(y) - l(x) \geq 1$. Using 5.3, then (a),(b) and the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{p}_{xz,yz} &= \sum_{u'; xz \leq u' \leq yz} r_{xz,u'} p_{u',yz} = \sum_{u \in W_I; x \leq u \leq y} r_{xz,uz} p_{uz,yz} \\ &= \sum_{u \in W_I; x \leq u \leq y} r_{x,u}^I p_{uz,yz} = \sum_{u \in W_I; x < u \leq y} r_{x,u}^I p_{u,y}^I + p_{xz,yz}. \end{aligned}$$

Using 5.3 for W_I we have $\bar{p}_{x,y}^I = \sum_{y; x \leq u \leq y} r_{x,u}^I p_{u,y}^I$. Comparing with the previous equality we deduce

$$\bar{p}_{xz,yz} - \bar{p}_{x,y}^I = p_{xz,yz} - p_{x,y}^I.$$

The right hand side of this equality is in $\mathcal{A}_{<0}$. Since it is fixed by $\bar{}$, it must be 0. This proves (c). Now (d) is an immediate consequence of (c) (with $z = 1$).

We prove (e). By 6.3(ii) we have

$$\sum_{u'; xz \leq u' < yz; su' < u'} p_{xz,u'} \mu_{u',yz}^s - v_s p_{xz,yz} \in \mathcal{A}_{<0}.$$

We rewrite this using (a):

$$\sum_{u \in W_I; x \leq u < y; su < u} p_{xz,uz} \mu_{uz,yz}^s - v_s p_{xz,yz} \in \mathcal{A}_{<0}.$$

We may assume that for all u in the sum, other than $u = x$ we have $\mu_{uz,yz}^s = \mu_{u,y}^{s,I}$.

Using this and (d), we obtain

$$\mu_{xz,yz}^s + \sum_{u \in W_I; x < u < y; su < u} p_{x,u}^I \mu_{u,y}^{s,I} - v_s p_{x,y}^I \in \mathcal{A}_{<0}.$$

By 6.3(ii) for W_I we have

$$\mu_{x,y}^{s,I} + \sum_{u \in W_I; x < u < y; su < u} p_{x,u}^I \mu_{u,y}^{s,I} - v_s p_{x,y}^I \in \mathcal{A}_{<0}.$$

It follows that $\mu_{xz,yz}^s - \mu_{x,y}^{s,I} \in \mathcal{A}_{<0}$. On the other hand, $\mu_{xz,yz}^s - \mu_{x,y}^{s,I}$ is fixed by $-$ (see 6.3(ii)) hence it is 0. This proves (e). The lemma is proved.

Proposition 9.11. *Assume that $L(s) > 0$ for all $s \in I$.*

(a) *Let $z \in W$ be such that z is the element of minimal length of $W_I z$. If x, y in W_I satisfy $x \leq_{\mathcal{L}} y$ (relative to W_I), then $xz \leq_{\mathcal{L}} yz$ (in W). If x, y in W_I satisfy $x \sim_{\mathcal{L}} y$ (relative to W_I), then $xz \sim_{\mathcal{L}} yz$ (in W).*

(b) *Let $z \in W$ be such that z is the element of minimal length of zW_I . If x, y in W_I satisfy $x \leq_{\mathcal{R}} y$ (relative to W_I), then $zx \leq_{\mathcal{R}} zy$ (in W). If x, y in W_I satisfy $x \sim_{\mathcal{R}} y$ (relative to W_I), then $zx \sim_{\mathcal{R}} zy$ (in W).*

We prove the first assertion of (a). We may assume that $x \leftarrow_{\mathcal{L}} y$ (relative to W_I) and $x \neq y$. Thus, there exists $s \in I$ such that $sy > y$, $sx < x$ and we have either $x = sy$ or $x < y$ and $\mu_{x,y}^s \neq 0$. If $x = sy$, then $sxz < xz = syz > yz$, hence $xz \leftarrow_{\mathcal{L}} yz$ (in W). Thus, we may assume that $x < y$ and $\mu_{x,y}^s \neq 0$. By 9.10(e) we then have $\mu_{xz,yz}^s \neq 0$, hence $xz \leftarrow_{\mathcal{L}} yz$ (in W). The first assertion of (a) is proved. The second assertion of (a) follows from the first. (b) follows by applying (a) to z^{-1}, x^{-1}, y^{-1} instead of z, x, y .

9.12. Assume that $z \in W$ is such that $W_I z = zW_I$ and z is the element of minimal length of $W_I z = zW_I$. Then $y \mapsto z^{-1}yz$ is an automorphism of W_I . If $s \in I$ then, by 9.7, we have $l(sz) = l(s) + l(z) = 1 + l(z)$; by 9.7 applied to $W_I z^{-1}$ instead of $W_I z$ we have $l((z^{-1}sz)z^{-1}) = l(z^{-1}sz) + l(z^{-1})$ hence $l(z^{-1}s) = l(z^{-1}sz) + l(z^{-1})$; since $l(z^{-1}s) = l(sz)$ and $l(z^{-1}) = l(z)$, it follows that $l(z^{-1}sz) + l(z^{-1}) = 1 + l(z)$, hence $l(z^{-1}sz) = 1$. We see that $y \mapsto z^{-1}yz$ maps I onto itself hence it is an automorphism of W_I as a Coxeter group. This automorphism preserves the function $L|_{W_I}$. Indeed, if $y \in W_I$, then

$l(zyz^{-1}) + l(z) = l((zyz^{-1})z) = l(zy) = l(y^{-1}z^{-1}) = l(y^{-1}) + l(z^{-1}) = l(y) + l(z)$ (by 9.7 applied to $W_I z$ and to $W_I z^{-1}$) hence

$$\begin{aligned} L(zyz^{-1}) + L(z) &= L((zyz^{-1})z) = L(zy) = L(y^{-1}z^{-1}) \\ &= L(y^{-1}) + L(z^{-1}) = L(y) + L(z), \end{aligned}$$

so that $L(zyz^{-1}) = L(z)$. In particular, this automorphism respects the preorders $\leq_{\mathcal{L}}, \leq_{\mathcal{R}}, \leq_{\mathcal{LR}}$ of W_I (defined in terms of $L|_{W_I}$) and the associated equivalence relations.

Proposition 9.13. *Assume that $L(s) > 0$ for all $s \in I$. Let z be as in 9.12. If x, y in W_I satisfy $x \leq_{\mathcal{LR}} y$ (relative to W_I), then $xz \leq_{\mathcal{LR}} yz$ (in W). If x, y in W_I satisfy $x \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} y$ (relative to W_I), then $xz \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} yz$ (in W).*

We prove the first assertion. We may assume that either $x \leq_{\mathcal{L}} y$ (in W_I) or $x \leq_{\mathcal{R}} y$ (in W_I). In the first case then, by 9.11(a), we have $xz \leq_{\mathcal{L}} yz$ (in W) hence $xz \leq_{\mathcal{LR}} yz$ (in W). In the second case, by 9.12, we have $z^{-1}xz \leq_{\mathcal{R}} z^{-1}yz$. Applying 9.11(b) to $z^{-1}xz, z^{-1}yz$ instead of x, y we see that $xz \leq_{\mathcal{R}} yz$ (in W) hence $xz \leq_{\mathcal{LR}} yz$ (in W). This proves the first assertion. The second assertion follows from the first.

10. INVERSION

10.1. For $y, w \in W$ we define $q'_{y,w} \in \mathcal{A}$ by

$$q'_{y,w} = \sum (-1)^n p_{z_0, z_1} p_{z_1, z_2} \cdots p_{z_{n-1}, z_n} \\ (\text{sum over all sequences } y = z_0 < z_1 < z_2 < \cdots < z_n = w \text{ in } W) \text{ and} \\ q_{y,w} = \text{sgn}(y) \text{sgn}(w) q'_{y,w}.$$

We have

$$q_{w,w} = 1, \\ q_{y,w} \in \mathcal{A}_{<0} \text{ if } y \neq w, \\ q_{y,w} = 0 \text{ unless } y \leq w.$$

Proposition 10.2. *For any $y, w \in W$ we have*

$$\bar{q}_{y,w} = \sum_{z; y \leq z \leq w} q_{y,z} r_{z,w}.$$

The (triangular) matrices $Q' = (q'_{y,w}), P = (p_{y,w}), R = (r_{y,w})$ are related by

$$(a) \quad Q'P = PQ' = 1, \bar{P} = RP, \bar{R}R = R\bar{R} = 1$$

where $\bar{}$ over a matrix is the matrix obtained by applying $\bar{}$ to each entry. (Although the matrices may be infinite, the products are well defined as each entry of a product is obtained by finitely many operations.) The last three equations in (a) are obtained from 5.3, 4.6; the equations involving Q' follow from the definition. From (a) we deduce

$$Q'P = 1 = \bar{Q}'\bar{P} = \bar{Q}'RP.$$

Hence $Q'P = \bar{Q}'RP$. Multiplying on the right by Q' and using $PQ' = 1$ we deduce $Q' = \bar{Q}'R$. Multiplying on the right by $\bar{R}$ we deduce

$$(b) \quad \bar{Q}' = Q'\bar{R}.$$

Let $\mathbf{s}$ be the matrix whose y, w entry is $\text{sgn}(y)\delta_{y,w}$. We have $\mathbf{s}^2 = 1$. Let Q be the triangular matrix $(q_{y,w})$. Note that $Q = \mathbf{s}Q'\mathbf{s}$. By 4.5 we have $\bar{R} = \mathbf{s}R\mathbf{s}$. Hence by multiplying the two sides of (b) on the left and right by $\mathbf{s}$ we obtain $\bar{Q} = QR$. The proposition is proved.

10.3. Let $\tau : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be the $\mathcal{A}$ -linear map defined by $\tau(T_w) = \delta_{w,1}$ for $w \in W$.

Lemma 10.4. (a) *For $x, y \in W$ we have $\tau(T_x T_y) = \delta_{xy,1}$.*

(b) *For $h, h' \in \mathcal{H}$ we have $\tau(hh') = \tau(h'h)$.*

(c) *Let $x, y, z \in W$ and let $M = \min(L(x), L(y), L(z))$. We have $\tau(T_x T_y T_z) \in v^M \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}]$.*

We prove (a) by induction on $l(y)$. If $l(y) = 0$, the result is clear. Assume now that $l(y) \geq 1$. If $l(xy) = l(x) + l(y)$ then $T_x T_y = T_{xy}$ and the result is clear.

Hence we may assume that $l(xy) \neq l(x) + l(y)$. Then $l(xy) < l(x) + l(y)$. Let $y = s_1 s_2 \dots s_q$ be a reduced expression. We can find $i \in [1, q]$ such that

$$(d) \ l(x) + i - 1 = l(xs_1 s_2 \dots s_{i-1}) > l(xs_1 s_2 \dots s_{i-1} s_i).$$

We show that

$$(e) \ xs_1 s_2 \dots s_{i-1} s_{i+1} \dots s_q \neq 1.$$

If (e) does not hold, then $x = s_q \dots s_{i+1} s_{i-1} \dots s_1$, so that

$$l(xs_1 s_2 \dots s_{i-1}) = l(s_q \dots s_{i+1} s_{i-1} \dots s_1 s_1 \dots s_{i-1}) = l(s_q \dots s_{i+1}) = q - i,$$

$$l(xs_1 s_2 \dots s_{i-1} s_i) = l(s_q \dots s_{i+1} s_{i-1} \dots s_1 s_1 \dots s_i) = l(s_q \dots s_{i+1} s_i) = q - i + 1,$$

contradicting (d). Thus (e) holds. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(T_x T_y) &= \tau(T_x T_{s_1} T_{s_2} \dots T_{s_q}) = \tau(T_{xs_1 s_2 \dots s_{i-1}} T_{s_i} T_{s_{i+1} \dots s_q}) \\ &= \tau(T_{xs_1 s_2 \dots s_{i-1} s_i} T_{s_{i+1} \dots s_q}) + (v_s - v_s^{-1}) \tau(T_{xs_1 s_2 \dots s_{i-1}} T_{s_{i+1} \dots s_q}). \end{aligned}$$

Using the induction hypothesis and (d) we see that this equals

$$\delta_{xs_1 s_2 \dots s_{i-1} s_i s_{i+1} \dots s_q, 1} + (v_s - v_s^{-1}) \delta_{xs_1 s_2 \dots s_{i-1} s_{i+1} \dots s_q, 1} = \delta_{xy, 1}.$$

This completes the proof of (a). To prove (b), we may assume that $h = T_x, h' = T_y$ for $x, y \in W$; we then use (a) and the obvious equality $\delta_{xy, 1} = \delta_{yx, 1}$.

We prove (c). Using b) we see that $\tau(T_x T_y T_z) = \tau(T_y T_z T_x) = \tau(T_z T_x T_y)$. Hence it is enough to show that, for any x, y, z we have

$$\tau(T_x T_y T_z) \in v^{L(x)} \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}].$$

We argue by induction on $l(x)$. If $x = 1$, the result follows from (a). Assume now that $l(x) \geq 1$. We can find $s \in S$ such that $xs < x$. If $sy > y$, then by the induction hypothesis,

$$\tau(T_x T_y T_z) = \tau(T_{xs} T_{sy} T_z) \in v^{L(x)-L(s)} \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}] \subset v^{L(x)} \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}].$$

If $sy < y$, then by the induction hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(T_x T_y T_z) &= \tau(T_{xs} T_{sy} T_z) + (v_s - v_s^{-1}) \tau(T_{xs} T_y T_z) \\ &\in v^{L(x)-L(s)} \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}] + v_s v^{L(x)-L(s)} \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}] \subset v^{L(x)} \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}]. \end{aligned}$$

The lemma is proved.

10.5. Let $\mathcal{H}' = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{A})$. We regard $\mathcal{H}'$ as a left $\mathcal{H}$ -module where, for $h \in \mathcal{H}, \phi \in \mathcal{H}'$ we have $(h\phi)(h_1) = \phi(h_1 h)$ for all $h_1 \in \mathcal{H}$ and as a right $\mathcal{H}$ -module where, for $h \in \mathcal{H}, \phi \in \mathcal{H}'$, we have $(\phi h)(h_1) = \phi(h h_1)$ for all $h_1 \in \mathcal{H}$.

10.6. We sometimes identify $\mathcal{H}'$ with the set of all formal sums $\sum_{x \in W} a_x T_x$ with $a_x \in \mathcal{A}$; to $\phi \in \mathcal{H}'$ corresponds the formal sum $\sum_{x \in W} \phi(T_{x^{-1}}) T_x$. Since $\mathcal{H}$ is contained in the set of such formal sums (it is the set of sums such that $c_x = 0$ for all but finitely many x), we see that $\mathcal{H}$ is naturally a subset of $\mathcal{H}'$. Using 10.4(a) we see that the imbedding $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H}'$ is an imbedding of $\mathcal{H}$ -bimodules; it is an equality if W is finite.

10.7. Let $z \in W$. Recall that in 8.1 we have defined $D_z \in \mathcal{H}'$ by $D_z(c_w) = \delta_{z,w}$ for all w . An equivalent definition is

$$(a) \ D_z(T_y) = q'_{z,y}$$

for all $y \in W$. Indeed, assuming that (a) holds, we have

$$D_z(c_w) = \sum_y q'_{z,y} p_{y,w} = \delta_{z,w}.$$

Proposition 10.8. *Let $z \in W, s \in S$. Assume that $L(s) > 0$.*

- (a) *If $zs < z$, then $c_s D_z = (v_s + v_s^{-1})D_z + D_{zs} + \sum_{u; z < u < us} \mu_{z^{-1}, u^{-1}}^s D_u$.*
 (b) *If $zs > z$, then $c_s D_z = 0$.*

For $a, b \in W$ we define $\delta_{a < b}$ to be 1 if $a < b$ and 0 otherwise. Let $w \in W$. If $ws > w$, then by 6.7(a), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (c_s D_z)(c_w) &= D_z(c_w c_s) = D_z(c_{ws} + \sum_{\substack{x \\ xs < x < w}} \mu_{x^{-1}, w^{-1}}^s c_x) \\ (c) \quad &= \delta_{z, ws} + \sum_{\substack{x \\ xs < x < w}} \mu_{x^{-1}, w^{-1}}^s \delta_{z, x}. \end{aligned}$$

If $ws < w$, then by 6.7(b), we have

$$(d) \quad (c_s D_z)(c_w) = D_z(c_w c_s) = (v_s + v_s^{-1})D_z(c_w) = (v_s + v_s^{-1})\delta_{z, w}.$$

If $zs < z, ws > w$, then by (c):

$$(c_s D_z)(c_w) = \delta_{zs, w} + \delta_{z < w} \mu_{z^{-1}, w^{-1}}^s = ((v_s + v_s^{-1})D_z + D_{zs} + \sum_{\substack{u \\ z < u < us}} \mu_{z^{-1}, u^{-1}}^s D_u)(c_w).$$

If $zs < z, ws < w$, then by (d):

$$(c_s D_z)(c_w) = (v_s + v_s^{-1})\delta_{z, w} = ((v_s + v_s^{-1})D_z + D_{zs} + \sum_{\substack{u \\ z < u < us}} \mu_{z^{-1}, u^{-1}}^s D_u)(c_w).$$

If $zs > z, ws > w$, then by (c), we have $(c_s D_z)(c_w) = 0$. If $zs > z, ws < w$, then by (d), we have $(c_s D_z)(c_w) = 0$. Since (c_w) is an $\mathcal{A}$ -basis of $\mathcal{H}$, the proposition follows.

11. THE LONGEST ELEMENT FOR A FINITE W

11.1. Let $I \subset S$ be such that W_I is finite. By 9.8, there is a unique element of maximal length of W_I . We denote it by w_0^I . If w_1 has minimal length in $W_I a$ then $w_0^I w_1$ has maximal length in $W_I a$.

11.2. In the remainder of this section we assume that W is finite. Then w_0^S , the unique element of maximal length of W is well defined. Traditionally one writes w_0 instead of w_0^S . Since $l(w_0^{-1}) = l(w_0)$, we must have

$$w_0^{-1} = w_0.$$

By the argument in the proof of 9.8 we have $w \leq w_0$ for any $w \in W$. By 9.8 we have

$$(a) \quad l(w w_0) = l(w_0) - l(w)$$

for any $w \in W$. Applying this to w^{-1} and using the equalities $l(w^{-1} w_0) = l(w_0^{-1} w) = l(w_0 w)$, $l(w^{-1}) = l(w)$, we deduce that

$$(b) \ l(w_0w) = l(w_0) - l(w).$$

We can rewrite (a),(b) as

$$l(w_0) = l(w^{-1}) + l(ww_0), \ l(w_0) = l(w_0w) + l(w^{-1}).$$

Using this and the definition of L we deduce that

$$L(w^{-1}) + L(ww_0) = L(w_0) = L(w_0w) + L(w^{-1}),$$

hence $L(ww_0) = L(w_0w)$. This implies $L(w_0ww_0) = L(w)$ for all w . Replacing L by l we deduce that $l(w_0ww_0) = l(w)$. Thus, the (involutive) automorphism $w \mapsto w_0ww_0$ of W maps S into itself hence is a Coxeter group automorphism preserving the function L .

Lemma 11.3. *Let $y, w \in W$. We have*

$$(a) \ y \leq w \Leftrightarrow w_0w \leq w_0y \Leftrightarrow ww_0 \leq yw_0.$$

$$(b) \ r_{y,w} = r_{ww_0,yw_0} = r_{w_0w,w_0y};$$

$$(c) \ \bar{p}_{ww_0,yw_0} = \sum_{z; y \leq z \leq w} p_{zw_0,yw_0} r_{z,w}.$$

We prove (a). To prove that $y \leq w \implies w_0w \leq w_0y$, we may assume that $l(w) - l(y) = 1, yw^{-1} \in T$. Then

$$l(yw_0) - l(ww_0) = l(w_0) - l(y) - (l(w_0) - l(w)) = l(w) - l(y) = 1$$

and $(ww_0)(yw_0)^{-1} = wy^{-1} \in T$. Hence $w_0w \leq w_0y$. The opposite implication is proved in the same way. The second equivalence in (a) follows from the last sentence in 11.2.

We prove the first equality in (b) by induction on $l(w)$. If $l(w) = 0$ then $w = 1$. We have $r_{y,1} = \delta_{y,1}$. Now r_{w_0,w_0y} is zero unless $w_0 \leq w_0y$ (see 4.7). On the other hand we have $w_0y \leq w_0$ (see 11.2). Hence r_{w_0,w_0y} is zero unless $w_0y = w_0$, that is unless $y = 1$ in which case it is 1. Thus the desired equality holds when $l(w) = 0$. Assume now that $l(w) \geq 1$. We can find $s \in S$ such that $sw < w$. Then $sww_0 > ww_0$ by (a).

Assume first that $sy < y$ (hence $syw_0 > yw_0$.) Using 4.4 and the induction hypothesis we have

$$r_{y,w} = r_{sy,sw} = r_{sww_0,syw_0} = r_{ww_0,yw_0}.$$

Assume next that $sy > y$ (hence $syw_0 < yw_0$.) Using 4.4 and the induction hypothesis we have

$$\begin{aligned} r_{y,w} &= r_{sy,sw} + (v_s - v_s^{-1})r_{y,sw} = r_{sww_0,syw_0} + (v_s - v_s^{-1})r_{sww_0,yw_0} \\ &= r_{sww_0,syw_0} + (v_s - v_s^{-1})r_{ww_0,syw_0} = r_{ww_0,yw_0}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the first equality in (b). The second equality in (b) follows from the last sentence in 11.2.

We prove (c). We may assume that $y \leq w$. By 5.3 (for ww_0, yw_0 instead of y, w we have

$\bar{p}_{ww_0,yw_0} = \sum_{z; y \leq z \leq w} r_{ww_0,zw_0} p_{zw_0,yw_0}$ (we have used (a)). Here we substitute $r_{ww_0,zw_0} = r_{z,w}$ (see (b)) and the result follows. The lemma is proved.

Proposition 11.4. *For any $y, w \in W$ we have $q_{y,w} = p_{ww_0,yw_0} = p_{w_0w,w_0y}$.*

The second equality follows from the last sentence in 11.2. We prove the first equality. We may assume that $y \leq w$. We argue by induction on $l(w) - l(y) \geq 0$. If $l(w) - l(y) = 0$ we have $y = w$ and both sides are 1. Assume now that $l(w) - l(y) \geq 1$. Subtracting the identity in 11.3(c) from that in 10.2 and using the induction hypothesis, we obtain

$$\bar{q}_{y,w} - \bar{p}_{ww_0,yw_0} = q_{y,w} - p_{ww_0,yw_0}.$$

The right hand side is in $\mathcal{A}_{<0}$; since it is fixed by $\bar{\cdot}$, it is 0. The proposition is proved.

Proposition 11.5. *We identify $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}'$ as in 10.6. If $z \in W$, then $D_{z^{-1}} \in \mathcal{H}'$ (see 10.7) becomes an element of $\mathcal{H}$. We have*

$$D_{z^{-1}}T_{w_0}^{-1} = \text{sgn}(zw_0)c_{zw_0}^\dagger, \quad (\dagger \text{ as in 3.5}).$$

By definition, $D_{z^{-1}} \in \mathcal{H}$ is characterized by

$$\tau(D_{z^{-1}}T_{y^{-1}}) = q'_{z^{-1},y^{-1}}$$

for all $y \in W$. Here τ is as in 10.3. Hence, by 10.4(a), we have $D_{z^{-1}} = \sum_y q'_{z^{-1},y^{-1}}T_y$. Using 11.4, we deduce

$$D_{z^{-1}} = \sum_y \text{sgn}(yz)p_{w_0y^{-1},w_0z^{-1}}T_y.$$

Multiplying on the right by $T_{w_0}^{-1}$ gives

$$D_{z^{-1}}T_{w_0}^{-1} = \sum_y \text{sgn}(yz)p_{w_0y^{-1},w_0z^{-1}}T_{w_0y^{-1}}^{-1}$$

since $T_{w_0y^{-1}}T_y = T_{w_0}$. On the other hand,

$$\text{sgn}(zw_0)c_{zw_0}^\dagger = \sum_x \text{sgn}(zw_0x)p_{x,zw_0}T_{x^{-1}}^{-1} = \sum_y \text{sgn}(zw_0yw_0)p_{yw_0,zw_0}T_{w_0y^{-1}}^{-1}.$$

We now use the identity $p_{yw_0,zw_0} = p_{w_0y^{-1},w_0z^{-1}}$. The proposition follows.

Proposition 11.6. *Let $u, z \in W, s \in S$ be such that $sz < z < u < su$. Assume that $L(s) > 0$. Then $suw_0 < uw_0 < zw_0 < szw_0$ and*

$$\mu_{uw_0,zw_0}^s = -\text{sgn}(uz)\mu_{z,u}^s.$$

Let $z \in W, s \in S$ be such that $sz < z$. Using 10.8(a), we see that

$$(c_s - (v_s + v_s^{-1}))D_{z^{-1}}T_{w_0}^{-1} = D_{z^{-1}s}T_{w_0}^{-1} + \sum_{u; z^{-1} < u^{-1} < u^{-1}s} \mu_{z,u}^s D_{u^{-1}}T_{w_0}^{-1},$$

hence, using 11.5, we have

$$(c_s - (v_s + v_s^{-1}))\text{sgn}(zw_0)c_{zw_0}^\dagger = \text{sgn}(zsw_0)c_{zsw_0}^\dagger + \sum_{u; z < u < su} \mu_{z,u}^s \text{sgn}(uw_0)c_{uw_0}^\dagger.$$

Applying † to both sides and using $(c_s - (v_s + v_s^{-1}))^\dagger = -c_s$ gives

$$(a) \quad -c_s c_{zw_0} = -c_{zsw_0} + \sum_{u; z < u < su} \mu_{z,u}^s \text{sgn}(uz)c_{uw_0}.$$

Since $zsw_0 > zw_0$, we can apply 6.6(a) and we get

$$c_s c_{zw_0} = c_{zsw_0} + \sum_{u'; su' < u' < zw_0} \mu_{u',zw_0}^s c_{u'}$$

or equivalently

$$c_s c_{zw_0} = c_{zsw_0} + \sum_{u; z < u < su} \mu_{uw_0,zw_0}^s c_{uw_0}.$$

Comparing this with (a) we get

$$-\sum_{u; z < u < su} \mu_{z,u}^s \text{sgn}(uz)c_{uw_0} = \sum_{u; z < u < su} \mu_{uw_0,zw_0}^s c_{uw_0};$$

the proposition follows.

Corollary 11.7. *Assume that $L(s) > 0$ for all $s \in S$. Let $y, w \in W$.*

- (a) $y \leq_{\mathcal{L}} w \Leftrightarrow ww_0 \leq_{\mathcal{L}} yw_0 \Leftrightarrow w_0w \leq_{\mathcal{L}} w_0y$;
- (b) $y \leq_{\mathcal{R}} w \Leftrightarrow ww_0 \leq_{\mathcal{R}} yw_0 \Leftrightarrow w_0w \leq_{\mathcal{R}} w_0y$;
- (c) $y \leq_{\mathcal{LR}} w \Leftrightarrow ww_0 \leq_{\mathcal{LR}} yw_0 \Leftrightarrow w_0w \leq_{\mathcal{LR}} w_0y$.
- (d) *Left multiplication by w_0 carries left cells to left cells, right cells to right cells, two-sided cells to two-sided cells. The same holds for right multiplication by w_0 .*

We prove the first equivalence in (a). It is enough to show that $y \leq_{\mathcal{L}} w \Rightarrow ww_0 \leq_{\mathcal{L}} yw_0$. We may assume that $y \leftarrow_{\mathcal{L}} w$ and $y \neq w$. Then there exists $s \in S$ such that $sw > w$, $sy < y$ and $D_y(c_s c_w) \neq 0$. We have $syw_0 > yw_0$, $sww_0 < ww_0$. From 6.6 we see that either $y = ws$ or $y < w$ and $\mu_{y,w}^s \neq 0$. In the first case we have $ww_0 = syw_0$; in the second case we have $ww_0 < yw_0$ and $\mu_{ww_0, yw_0}^s \neq 0$ (see 11.6). In both cases, 6.6 shows that $D_{ww_0}(c_s c_{yw_0}) \neq 0$. Hence $ww_0 \leq_{\mathcal{L}} yw_0$. Thus, the first equivalence in (a) is established. The second equivalence in (a) follows from the last sentence in 11.2.

Now (b) follows by applying (a) to y^{-1}, w^{-1} instead of (a); (c) follows from (a) and (b); (d) follows from (a),(b),(c). The corollary is proved.

12. EXAMPLES OF ELEMENTS D_w

Proposition 12.1. *Assume that $L(s) > 0$ for all $s \in S$. For any $y \in W$ we have $D_1(T_y) = \text{sgn}(y)v^{-L(y)}$. Equivalently, with the identification in 10.6, we have*

$$D_1 = \sum_{y \in W} \text{sgn}(y)v^{-L(y)}T_y.$$

An equivalent statement is that $q'_{1,y} = \text{sgn}(y)v^{-L(y)}$. Since $q'_{1,y}$ are determined by the equations $\sum_y q'_{1,y}p_{y,w} = \delta_{1,w}$ (see 10.2(a)) it is enough to show that

$$\sum_y \text{sgn}(y)v^{-L(y)}p_{y,w} = \delta_{1,w}$$

for all $w \in W$. If $w = 1$ this is clear. Assume now that $w \neq 1$. We can find $s \in S$ such that $sw < w$. We must prove that

$$\sum_{y; y < sy} \text{sgn}(y)v^{-L(y)}(p_{y,w} - v_s^{-1}p_{sy,w}) = 0.$$

Each term of the last sum is 0, by 6.6(c). The proposition is proved.

Corollary 12.2. *Assume that W is finite and that $L(s) > 0$ for all $s \in S$. Then*

$$c_{w_0} = \sum_{y \in W} v^{-L(yw_0)}T_y.$$

This follows immediately from 12.1 and 11.5. Alternatively, we can argue as follows. We prove that $p_{y,w_0} = v^{-L(yw_0)}$ for all y , by descending induction on $l(y)$. If $l(y)$ is maximal, that is $y = w_0$, then $p_{y,w_0} = 1$. Assume now that $l(y) < l(w_0)$. We can find $s \in S$ such that $l(sy) = l(y) + 1$. By the induction hypothesis we have $p_{sy,w_0} = v^{-L(syw_0)}$. By 6.6(c), we have

$$\begin{aligned} p_{y,w_0} &= v_s^{-1}p_{sy,w_0} = v^{-L(s)-L(syw_0)} = v^{-L(s)-L(w_0)+L(sy)} = v^{-L(w_0)+L(y)} = v^{-L(yw_0)}. \end{aligned}$$

The corollary is proved.

12.3. From 11.5 we see that $D_{z^{-1}}$ can be explicitly computed whenever W is finite and c_{zw_0} is known. In particular, in the setup of 7.4 with $m = 2k + 2 < \infty$, we can compute explicitly all $D_{z^{-1}}$ using 7.6(a). For example:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{s_1} &= \sum_{s \in [0, k-1]} (1 - v^{2L_1} + v^{4L_1} - \dots + (-1)^s v^{2sL_1}) v^{-sL_1 - sL_2} \\ &\times (T_{1_{2s+1}} - v^{-L_2} T_{2_{2s+2}} - v^{-L_2} T_{1_{2s+2}} + v^{-2L_2} T_{2_{2s+3}}) \\ &+ (1 - v^{2L_1} + v^{4L_1} - \dots + (-1)^k v^{2kL_1}) v^{-kL_1 - kL_2} (T_{1_{2k+1}} - v^{-L_2} T_{2_{2k+2}}). \end{aligned}$$

Using this (for larger and larger m) one can deduce that an analogous formula holds in the setup of 7.4 with $m = \infty$:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{s_1} &= \sum_{s \geq 0} (1 - v^{2L_1} + v^{4L_1} - \dots + (-1)^s v^{2sL_1}) v^{-sL_1 - sL_2} \\ (a) \quad &\times (T_{1_{2s+1}} - v^{-L_2} T_{2_{2s+2}} - v^{-L_2} T_{1_{2s+2}} + v^{-2L_2} T_{2_{2s+3}}) \in \mathcal{H}'. \end{aligned}$$

(We use the identification in 10.6.)

13. THE FUNCTION $\mathbf{a}$

13.1. In the remainder of these lectures we assume that $L(s) > 0$ for all $s \in S$. A reference for this section is [L3].

For x, y, z in W we define $f_{x,y,z} \in \mathcal{A}$, $f'_{x,y,z} \in \mathcal{A}$, $h_{x,y,z} \in \mathcal{A}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} T_x T_y &= \sum_{z \in W} f_{x,y,z} T_z = \sum_{z \in W} f'_{x,y,z} c_z, \\ c_x c_y &= \sum_{z \in W} h_{x,y,z} c_z. \end{aligned}$$

We have

- (a) $f_{x,y,z} = \sum_{z'} p_{z,z'} f'_{x,y,z'}$
 - (b) $f'_{x,y,z} = \sum_u q'_{z,z'} f_{x,y,z'}$,
 - (c) $h_{x,y,z} = \sum_{x',y'} p_{x',x} p_{y',y} f'_{x',y',z}$,
- (a),(c) follow from the definitions; (b) follows from (a) using 10.2(a). All sums in (a)-(c) are finite. From 8.2, 5.6, we see that
- (d) $h_{x,y,z} \neq 0 \implies z \leq_{\mathcal{R}} x, z \leq_{\mathcal{L}} y$,
 - (e) $h_{x,y,z} = h_{y^{-1}, x^{-1}, z^{-1}}$.

13.2. We say that $N \in \mathbf{N}$ is a *bound* for W, L if $v^{-N} f_{x,y,z} \in \mathcal{A}_{\leq 0}$ for all x, y, z in W . We say that W, L is *bounded* if there exists $N \in \mathbf{N}$ such that N is a bound for W, L . If W is finite then W, L is obviously bounded. More precisely:

Lemma 13.3. *If W is finite, then $N = L(w_0)$ is a bound for W, L .*

By 10.4(a) we have $f_{x,y,z} = \tau(T_x T_y T_{z^{-1}})$. By 10.4(c) we have $\tau(T_x T_y T_{z^{-1}}) \in v^{L(w_0)} \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}]$. The lemma is proved.

13.4. More generally, according to [L3, 7.2], if W is tame and $L = l$ then W, L is bounded; as a bound we can take

$$(a) \ N = \max_I L(w_0^I)$$

where I runs over the subsets of S such that W_I is finite. This result and its proof remain valid without the assumption $L = l$.

We illustrate this in the setup of 7.1 with $m = \infty$. For $a, b \in \{1, 2\}$ and $k > 0, k' > 0$, we have

$$T_{a_k} T_{b_{k'}} = T_{a_{k+k'}} \text{ if } b = a + k \pmod{2},$$

$$T_{a_k} T_{b_{k'}} = T_{a_k b_{k'}} + \sum_{u \in [1, \min(k, k')]} \xi_{b+u-1} T_{a_{k+k'-2u+1}} \text{ if } b = a + k + 1 \pmod{2};$$

here, for $n \in \mathbf{Z}$ we set $\xi_n = v^{L_1} - v^{-L_1}$ if n is odd and $\xi_n = v^{L_2} - v^{-L_2}$ if n is even. We see that, in this case, $\max(L_1, L_2)$ is a bound for W, L .

Question. Is it true, in the general case, that W, L admits a bound? If so, can the bound be taken as in (a)?

Lemma 13.5. *Assume that N is a bound for W, L . Then, for any x, y, z in W we have*

$$(a) \ v^{-N} f'_{x,y,z} \in \mathcal{A}_{\leq 0},$$

$$(b) \ v^{-N} h_{x,y,z} \in \mathcal{A}_{\leq 0}.$$

(a) follows from 13.1(b) since $q'_{z,z'} \in \mathcal{A}_{\leq 0}$. (b) follows from (a) and 13.1(c) since $p_{x',x} \in \mathcal{A}_{\leq 0}, p_{y',y} \in \mathcal{A}_{\leq 0}$.

13.6. *In the remainder of this section we assume that W, L is bounded. Let N be a bound for W, L . By 13.5(b), for any $z \in W$ there exists a unique integer $\mathbf{a}(z) \in [0, N]$ such that*

$$(a) \ h_{x,y,z} \in v^{\mathbf{a}(z)} \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}] \text{ for all } x, y \in W,$$

$$(b) \ h_{x,y,z} \notin v^{\mathbf{a}(z)-1} \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}] \text{ for some } x, y \in W.$$

(We use that $h_{1,z,z} = 1$.) We then have for any x, y, z :

$$(c) \ h_{x,y,z} = \gamma_{x,y,z-1} v^{\mathbf{a}(z)} \pmod{v^{\mathbf{a}(z)-1} \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}]}$$

where $\gamma_{x,y,z-1} \in \mathbf{Z}$ is well defined; moreover, for any $z \in W$ there exists x, y such that $\gamma_{x,y,z-1} \neq 0$.

For any x, y, z we have

$$(d) \ f'_{x,y,z} = \gamma_{x,y,z-1} v^{\mathbf{a}(z)} \pmod{v^{\mathbf{a}(z)-1} \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}]}.$$

This is proved (for fixed z) by induction on $l(x) + l(y)$ using (c) and 13.1(c). (Note that $p_{x',x} p_{y',y}$ is 1 if $x' = x, y' = y$ and is in $\mathcal{A}_{<0}$ otherwise.)

Proposition 13.7. (a) $\mathbf{a}(1) = 0$.

(b) If $z \in W - \{1\}$, then $\mathbf{a}(z) \geq \min_{s \in S} L(s) > 0$.

We prove (a). Let $x, y \in W$. Assume first that $y \neq 1$. We can find $s \in S$ such that $ys < y$. Then $c_y \in {}^s\mathcal{H}$. Since ${}^s\mathcal{H}$ is a left ideal (see 8.4) we have $c_x c_y \in {}^s\mathcal{H}$. Since $s1 > 1$, from the definition of ${}^s\mathcal{H}$ it then follows that $h_{x,y,1} = 0$.

Similarly, if $x \neq 1$, then $h_{x,y,1} = 0$. Since $h_{1,1,1} = 1$, (a) follows.

In the setup of (b) we can find $s \in S$ such that $sz < z$. By 6.6(b) we have $h_{s,z,z} = v_s + v_s^{-1}$. This shows that $\mathbf{a}(z) \geq L(s) > 0$. The proposition is proved.

Proposition 13.8. *Assume that W is finite.*

- (a) *We have $\mathbf{a}(w_0) = L(w_0)$.*
- (b) *For any $w \in W - \{w_0\}$ we have $\mathbf{a}(w) < L(w_0)$.*

For any $w \in W$ we have by definition $\mathbf{a}(w) \leq N$ where N is a bound for W, L ; by 13.3 we can take $N = L(w_0)$, hence $\mathbf{a}(w) \leq L(w_0)$.

We prove (a). From 6.6(b) we see that $T_s c_{w_0} = v_s c_{w_0}$ for any $s \in S$. Using this and 12.2, we see that

$$c_{w_0} c_{w_0} = \sum_{y \in W} v^{-L(yw_0)} v^{L(y)} c_{w_0},$$

hence

$$h_{w_0, w_0, w_0} = \sum_{y \in W} v^{-L(w_0)} v^{2L(y)} \in v^{L(w_0)} \pmod{v^{L(w_0)-1} \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}]}.$$

It follows that $\mathbf{a}(w_0) \geq L(w_0)$. Hence $\mathbf{a}(w_0) = L(w_0)$. This proves (a).

We prove (b). Let $z \in W$ be such that $\mathbf{a}(z) = L(w_0)$. We must prove that $z = w_0$. By 13.6(d), we can find x, y such that

$$f'_{x,y,z} = bv^{L(w_0)} + \text{strictly smaller powers of } v$$

where $b \in \mathbf{Z} - \{0\}$. For any $z' \neq z$ we have

$$f'_{x,y,z'} \in v^{L(w_0)} \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}]$$

(by 13.6 and the first sentence in the proof). Since $p_{z,z'} = 1$ for $z = z'$ and $p_{z,z'} \in \mathcal{A}_{<0}$ for $z' < z$, we see that the equality $f_{x,y,z} = \sum_{z'} p_{z,z'} f'_{x,y,z'}$ (see 13.1(a)), implies that

$$f_{x,y,z} = bv^{L(w_0)} + \text{strictly smaller powers of } v$$

with $b \neq 0$. Now $f_{x,y,z} = \tau(T_x T_y T_{z^{-1}})$. Using now 10.4(c) we see that

$$\min(L(x), L(y), L(z^{-1})) = L(w_0).$$

It follows that $x = y = z^{-1} = w_0$. The proposition is proved.

Proposition 13.9. (a) *For any $z \in W$ we have $\mathbf{a}(z) = \mathbf{a}(z^{-1})$.*

- (b) *For any $x, y, z \in W$ we have $\gamma_{x,y,z} = \gamma_{y^{-1}, x^{-1}, z^{-1}}$.*

This follows from 13.1(e).

13.10. We show that, in the setup of 7.1 with $m = \infty$ and $L_2 \geq L_1$, the function $\mathbf{a} : W \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ is given as follows:

- (a) $\mathbf{a}(1) = 0$,
- (b) $\mathbf{a}(1_1) = L_1, \mathbf{a}(2_1) = L_2$,
- (c) $\mathbf{a}(1_k) = \mathbf{a}(2_k) = L_2$ if $k \geq 2$.

Now (a) is contained in 13.7(a). If $s_2 z < z$ then, by the proof of 13.7(b) we have $\mathbf{a}(z) \geq L_2$. By 13.4, L_2 is a bound for W, L hence $\mathbf{a}(z) \leq L_2$ so that $\mathbf{a}(z) = L_2$. If $zs_2 < z$ then the previous argument is applicable to z^{-1} . Using 13.9, we see that $\mathbf{a}(z) = \mathbf{a}(z^{-1}) = L_2$.

Assume next that $z = 1_{2k+1}$ where $k \geq 1$. By 7.5, 7.6, we have

$$c_{1_2} c_{2_{2k}} = c_1 c_2 c_{2_{2k}} = (v^{L_2} + v^{-L_2}) c_1 c_{2_{2k}} = (v^{L_2} + v^{-L_2}) c_{1_{2k+1}},$$

hence $h_{1_2, 2_{2k}, z} = v^{L_2} + v^{-L_2}$. Thus, $\mathbf{a}(z) \geq L_2$. By 13.4 we have $\mathbf{a}(z) \leq L_2$ hence $\mathbf{a}(z) = L_2$.

It remains to consider the case where $z = s_1$. Assume first that $L_1 = L_2$. Then $\mathbf{a}(s_1) \leq L_1$ by 13.4 and $\mathbf{a}(s_1) \geq L_1$ by 13.7(b). Hence $\mathbf{a}(s_1) = L_1$.

Assume next that $L_1 < L_2$. Then $\mathcal{I} = \sum_{w \in W - \{1, s_1\}} \mathcal{A}c_w$ is a two-sided ideal $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{H}$ (see 8.8). Hence if x or y is in $W - \{1, s_1\}$, then $c_x c_y \in \mathcal{I}$ and $h_{x,y,s_1} = 0$. Using

$h_{1,1,s_1} = 0, h_{1,s_1,s_1} = h_{s_1,1,s_1} = 1, h_{s_1,s_1,s_1} = v^{L_1} + v^{-L_1}$
we see that $\mathbf{a}(s_1) = L_1$. Thus, (a),(b),(c) are established.

13.11. In this subsection we assume that we are in the setup of 7.1 with $4 \leq m < \infty$ and $L_2 > L_1$. By 7.8, we have

$h_{2_{m-1}, 2_{m-1}, 2_{m-1}} = (-1)^{(m-2)/2} v^{(mL_2 - (m-2)L_1)/2} +$ strictly smaller powers of v .
Hence $\mathbf{a}(2_{m-1}) \geq (mL_2 - (m-2)L_1)/2$.

One can show that the function $\mathbf{a} : W \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}(1) &= 0, \\ \mathbf{a}(1_1) &= L_1, \mathbf{a}(2_1) = L_2, \\ \mathbf{a}(1_{m-1}) &= L_2, \mathbf{a}(2_{m-1}) = (mL_2 - (m-2)L_1)/2, \\ \mathbf{a}(2_m) &= m(L_1 + L_2)/2, \\ \mathbf{a}(1_k) &= \mathbf{a}(2_k) = L_2 \text{ if } 1 < k < m-1. \end{aligned}$$

This remains true in the case where $L_1 = L_2$.

14. CONJECTURES

14.1. *In this section we assume that W, L is bounded.*

For an integer n we denote by $\pi_n : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ be the group homomorphism defined by $\pi_n(\sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} a_k v^k) = a_n$.

For $z \in W$ we denote by $\Delta(z)$ the integer ≥ 0 defined by

$$(a) \ p_{1,z} = n_z v^{-\Delta(z)} + \text{strictly smaller powers of } v, n_z \in \mathbf{Z} - \{0\}.$$

Note that $\Delta(1) = 0, 0 < \Delta(z) \leq L(z)$ for $z \neq 1$ (see ...) and $\Delta(z) = \Delta(z^{-1})$ for all z . Let

$$\mathcal{D} = \{z \in W \mid \mathbf{a}(z) = \Delta(z)\}.$$

Clearly, $z \in \mathcal{D} \implies z^{-1} \in \mathcal{D}$.

Conjectures 14.2. *The following properties hold.*

- P1. We have $\mathbf{a}(z) \leq \Delta(z)$.
- P2. If $d \in \mathcal{D}$ and $x, y \in W$ satisfy $\gamma_{x,y,d} \neq 0$, then $x = y^{-1}$.
- P3. If $y \in W$, there exists a unique $d \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\gamma_{y^{-1},y,d} \neq 0$.
- P4. If $z' \leq_{\mathcal{LR}} z$ then $\mathbf{a}(z') \geq \mathbf{a}(z)$. Hence, if $z' \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} z$, then $\mathbf{a}(z') = \mathbf{a}(z)$.
- P5. If $d \in \mathcal{D}, y \in W, \gamma_{y^{-1},y,d} \neq 0$, then $\gamma_{y^{-1},y,d} = n_d = \pm 1$.
- P6. If $d \in \mathcal{D}$, then $d^2 = 1$.
- P7. For any $x, y, z \in W$ we have $\gamma_{x,y,z} = \gamma_{y,z,x}$.
- P8. Let $x, y, z \in W$ be such that $\gamma_{x,y,z} \neq 0$. Then $x \sim_{\mathcal{L}} y^{-1}, y \sim_{\mathcal{L}} z^{-1}, z \sim_{\mathcal{L}} x^{-1}$.
- P9. If $z' \leq_{\mathcal{L}} z$ and $\mathbf{a}(z') = \mathbf{a}(z)$ then $z' \sim_{\mathcal{L}} z$.
- P10. If $z' \leq_{\mathcal{R}} z$ and $\mathbf{a}(z') = \mathbf{a}(z)$ then $z' \sim_{\mathcal{R}} z$.
- P11. If $z' \leq_{\mathcal{LR}} z$ and $\mathbf{a}(z') = \mathbf{a}(z)$ then $z' \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} z$.

P12. Let $I \subset S$. If $y \in W_I$, then $\mathbf{a}(y)$ computed in terms of W_I is equal to $\mathbf{a}(y)$ computed in terms of W .

P13. Any left cell Γ of W contains a unique element $d \in \mathcal{D}$. We have $\gamma_{x^{-1},x,d} \neq 0$ for all $x \in \Gamma$.

P14. For any $z \in W$ we have $z \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} z^{-1}$.

P15. Let v' be a second indeterminate and let $h'_{x,y,z} \in \mathbf{Z}[v', v'^{-1}]$ be obtained from $h_{x,y,z}$ by the substitution $v \mapsto v'$. If $x, x', y, w \in W$ satisfy $\mathbf{a}(w) = \mathbf{a}(y)$, then

$$\sum_{y'} h'_{w,x',y'} h_{x,y',y} = \sum_{y'} h_{x,w,y'} h'_{y',x',y}.$$

In §15-§17 we will verify the conjecture above in a number of cases.

Auxiliary statement 14.3. *Let $x, y, z, z' \in W$ be such that $\gamma_{x,y,z^{-1}} \neq 0$, $z' \leftarrow_{\mathcal{L}} z$. Then there exists $x' \in W$ such that $\pi_{\mathbf{a}(z)}(h_{x',y,z'}) \neq 0$. In particular, $\mathbf{a}(z') \geq \mathbf{a}(z)$.*

In this section we will show, that, if P1-P3 and 14.3 are assumed to be true, then P4-P14 are automatically true. The arguments follow [L3], [L4].

14.4. *14.3 $\implies$ P4.* Let z', z be as in P4. We can assume that $z' \neq z$ and that $z' \leftarrow_{\mathcal{L}} z$ or $z'^{-1} \leftarrow_{\mathcal{L}} z^{-1}$. In the first case, from 14.3 we get $\mathbf{a}(z') \geq \mathbf{a}(z)$. (We can find x, y such that $\gamma_{x,y,z^{-1}} \neq 0$.) In the second case, from 14.3 we get $\mathbf{a}(z'^{-1}) \geq \mathbf{a}(z^{-1})$ hence $\mathbf{a}(z') \geq \mathbf{a}(z)$.

14.5. *P1, P3 $\implies$ P5.* Let $x, y \in W$. Applying τ to $c_x c_y = \sum_z h_{x,y,z} c_z$ gives

$$\sum_z h_{x,y,z} p_{1,z} = \sum_{x',y'} p_{x',x} p_{y',y} \tau(T_{x'} T_{y'}) = \sum_{x',y'} p_{x',x} p_{y',y} \delta_{x'y',1} = \sum_{x'} p_{x',x} p_{x'^{-1},y}$$

hence

$$(a) \quad \sum_z h_{x,y,z} p_{1,z} = \delta_{xy,1} \pmod{v^{-1} \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}]}.$$

We take $x = y^{-1}$ and note that $h_{y^{-1},y,z} \in v^{\mathbf{a}(z)} \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}]$, $p_{1,z} \in v^{-\Delta(z)} \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}]$, hence

$$h_{y^{-1},y,z} p_{1,z} \in v^{\mathbf{a}(z) - \Delta(z)} \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}].$$

The same argument shows that, if $z \in \mathcal{D}$, then

$$h_{y^{-1},y,z} p_{1,z} \in \gamma_{y^{-1},y,z^{-1}} n_z + v^{-1} \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}].$$

If $z \notin \mathcal{D}$ then, by P1, we have $\mathbf{a}(z) - \Delta(z) < 0$ so that $h_{y^{-1},y,z} p_{1,z} \in v^{-1} \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}]$.

We now see that

$$\sum_z h_{y^{-1},y,z} p_{1,z} = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{D}} \gamma_{y^{-1},y,z^{-1}} n_z \pmod{v^{-1} \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}]}.$$

Comparing with (a) we see that $\sum_{z \in \mathcal{D}} \gamma_{y^{-1},y,z^{-1}} n_z = 1$. Equivalently,

$$\sum_{z \in \mathcal{D}} \gamma_{y^{-1},y,z} n_z = 1.$$

Using this and P3 we see that, in the setup of P5 we have $\gamma_{y^{-1},y,d} n_d = 1$. Since $\gamma_{y^{-1},y,d}, n_d$ are integers, we must have $\gamma_{y^{-1},y,d} = n_d = \pm 1$.

14.6. *P2, P3 $\implies$ P6.* We can find x, y such that $\gamma_{x,y,d} \neq 0$. By P2, we have $x = y^{-1}$ so that $\gamma_{y^{-1},y,d} \neq 0$. This implies $\gamma_{y^{-1},y,d^{-1}} \neq 0$. (See 13.9(b)). We have $d^{-1} \in \mathcal{D}$. By the uniqueness in P3 we have $d = d^{-1}$.

14.7. $P2, P3, P4, P5 \implies P7$. We first prove the following statement.

(a) *Let $x, y, z \in W, d \in \mathcal{D}$ be such that $\gamma_{x,y,z} \neq 0$, $\gamma_{z^{-1},z,d} \neq 0$, $\mathbf{a}(d) = \mathbf{a}(z)$.*

Then $\gamma_{x,y,z} = \gamma_{y,z,x}$.

Let $n = \mathbf{a}(d)$. From $\gamma_{x,y,z} \neq 0$ we deduce $h_{x,y,z^{-1}} \neq 0$ hence $z^{-1} \leq_{\mathcal{R}} x$, hence $n = \mathbf{a}(z) = \mathbf{a}(z^{-1}) \geq \mathbf{a}(x)$ (see P4). Computing the coefficient of c_d in two ways, we obtain

$$\sum_{z'} h_{x,y,z'} h_{z',z,d} = \sum_{x'} h_{x,x',d} h_{y,z,x'}.$$

Now $h_{z',z,d} \neq 0$ implies $d \leq_{\mathcal{R}} z'$ hence $\mathbf{a}(z') \leq \mathbf{a}(d) = n$ (see P4); similarly, $h_{x,x',d} \neq 0$ implies $d \leq_{\mathcal{L}} x'$ hence $\mathbf{a}(x') \leq \mathbf{a}(d) = n$. Thus we have

$$\sum_{z'; \mathbf{a}(z') \leq n} h_{x,y,z'} h_{z',z,d} = \sum_{x'; \mathbf{a}(x') \leq n} h_{x,x',d} h_{y,z,x'}.$$

By P2 and our assumptions, the left hand side is

$$\gamma_{x,y,z} \gamma_{z^{-1},z,d} v^{2n} + \text{strictly smaller powers of } v.$$

Similarly, the right hand side is

$$\gamma_{x,x^{-1},d} \pi_n(h_{y,z,x^{-1}}) v^{2n} + \text{strictly smaller powers of } v.$$

Hence $\gamma_{x,x^{-1},d} \pi_n(h_{y,z,x^{-1}}) = \gamma_{x,y,z} \gamma_{z^{-1},z,d} \neq 0$. Thus,

$$\gamma_{x,x^{-1},d} \neq 0, \pi_n(h_{y,z,x^{-1}}) \neq 0.$$

We see that $\mathbf{a}(x^{-1}) \geq n$. But we have also $\mathbf{a}(x) \leq n$ hence $\mathbf{a}(x) = n$ and $\pi_n(h_{y,z,x^{-1}}) = \gamma_{y,z,x}$. Since $\gamma_{x,x^{-1},d} \neq 0$, we have (by P5) $\gamma_{x,x^{-1},d} = \gamma_{z^{-1},z,d}$. Using this and $\gamma_{x,x^{-1},d} \gamma_{y,z,x} = \gamma_{x,y,z} \gamma_{z^{-1},z,d}$ we deduce $\gamma_{y,z,x} = \gamma_{x,y,z}$, as required.

Next we prove the following statement.

(b) *Let $z \in W, d \in \mathcal{D}$ be such that $\gamma_{z^{-1},z,d} \neq 0$. Then $\mathbf{a}(z) = \mathbf{a}(d)$.*

We shall assume that (b) holds whenever $\mathbf{a}(z) > N_0$ and we shall deduce that it also holds when $\mathbf{a}(z) = N_0$. (This will prove (b) by descending induction on $\mathbf{a}(z)$ since $\mathbf{a}(z)$ is bounded above.) Assume that $\mathbf{a}(z) = N_0$. From $\gamma_{z^{-1},z,d} = \pm 1$ we deduce that $h_{z^{-1},z,d^{-1}} \neq 0$ hence $d^{-1} \leq_{\mathcal{L}} z^{-1}$ hence $\mathbf{a}(d^{-1}) \geq \mathbf{a}(z^{-1})$ (see P4) and $\mathbf{a}(d) \geq \mathbf{a}(z)$. Assume that $\mathbf{a}(d) > \mathbf{a}(z)$, that is, $\mathbf{a}(d) > N_0$. Let $d' \in \mathcal{D}$ be such that $\gamma_{d^{-1},d,d'} \neq 0$ (see P3). By the induction hypothesis applied to d, d' instead of z, d , we have $\mathbf{a}(d) = \mathbf{a}(d')$. From $\gamma_{z^{-1},z,d} \neq 0$, $\gamma_{d^{-1},d,d'} \neq 0$, $\mathbf{a}(d) = \mathbf{a}(d')$, we deduce (using (a)) that $\gamma_{z,d,z^{-1}} = \gamma_{z^{-1},z,d}$. Hence $\gamma_{z,d,z^{-1}} \neq 0$. It follows that $h_{z,d,z} \neq 0$, hence $z \leq_{\mathcal{L}} d$, hence $\mathbf{a}(z) \geq \mathbf{a}(d)$ (see P4). This contradicts the assumption $\mathbf{a}(d) > \mathbf{a}(z)$. Hence we must have $\mathbf{a}(z) = \mathbf{a}(d)$, as required.

We now prove P7. Assume first that $\gamma_{x,y,z} \neq 0$. Let $d \in \mathcal{D}$ be such that $\gamma_{z^{-1},z,d} \neq 0$ (see P3). By (b) we have $\mathbf{a}(z) = \mathbf{a}(d)$. Using (a) we then have $\gamma_{x,y,z} = \gamma_{y,z,x}$. Assume next that $\gamma_{x,y,z} = 0$; we must show that $\gamma_{y,z,x} = 0$. We assume that $\gamma_{y,z,x} \neq 0$. By the first part of the proof, we have

$$\gamma_{y,z,x} \neq 0 \implies \gamma_{y,z,x} = \gamma_{z,x,y} \neq 0 \implies \gamma_{z,x,y} = \gamma_{x,y,z} \neq 0,$$

a contradiction.

14.8. $P7 \implies P8$. If $\gamma_{x,y,z} \neq 0$, then $h_{x,y,z^{-1}} \neq 0$, hence $z^{-1} \leq_{\mathcal{L}} y, z \leq_{\mathcal{L}} x^{-1}$. By P7 we also have $\gamma_{y,z,x} \neq 0$ (hence $x^{-1} \leq_{\mathcal{L}} z, x \leq_{\mathcal{L}} y^{-1}$) and $\gamma_{z,x,y} \neq 0$ (hence $y^{-1} \leq_{\mathcal{L}} x, y \leq_{\mathcal{L}} z^{-1}$). Thus, we have $x \sim_{\mathcal{L}} y^{-1}, y \sim_{\mathcal{L}} z^{-1}, z \sim_{\mathcal{L}} x^{-1}$.

14.9. $14.3, P4, P8 \implies P9$. We can find a sequence $z' = z_0, z_1, \dots, z_n = z$ such that for any $j \in [1, n]$ we have $z_{j-1} \leq_{\mathcal{L}} z_j$. By P4 we have $\mathbf{a}(z') = \mathbf{a}(z_0) \geq \mathbf{a}(z_1) \geq$

$\cdots \geq \mathbf{a}(z_n) = \mathbf{a}(z)$. Since $\mathbf{a}(z) = \mathbf{a}(z')$, we have $\mathbf{a}(z') = \mathbf{a}(z_0) = \mathbf{a}(z_1) = \cdots = \mathbf{a}(z_n) = \mathbf{a}(z)$. Thus, it suffices to show that, if $z' \leftarrow_{\mathcal{L}} z$ and $\mathbf{a}(z') = \mathbf{a}(z)$, then $z' \sim_{\mathcal{L}} z$. Let $x, y \in W$ be such that $\gamma_{x,y,z^{-1}} \neq 0$. By 14.3, there exists $x' \in W$ such that $\pi_{\mathbf{a}(z)}(h_{x',y,z'}) \neq 0$. Since $\mathbf{a}(z') = \mathbf{a}(z)$, we have $\gamma_{x',y,z'^{-1}} \neq 0$. From $\gamma_{x,y,z^{-1}} \neq 0$, $\gamma_{x',y,z'^{-1}} \neq 0$ we deduce, using P8, that $y \sim_{\mathcal{L}} z, y \sim_{\mathcal{L}} z'$, hence $z \sim_{\mathcal{L}} z'$.

14.10. $P9 \implies P10$. We apply P9 to z^{-1}, z'^{-1} .

14.11. $P4, P9, P10 \implies P11$. We can find a sequence $z' = z_0, z_1, \dots, z_n = z$ such that for any $j \in [1, n]$ we have $z_{j-1} \leq_{\mathcal{L}} z_j$ or $z_{j-1} \leq_{\mathcal{R}} z_j$. By P4, we have $\mathbf{a}(z') = \mathbf{a}(z_0) \geq \mathbf{a}(z_1) \geq \cdots \geq \mathbf{a}(z_n) = \mathbf{a}(z)$. Since $\mathbf{a}(z) = \mathbf{a}(z')$, we have $\mathbf{a}(z') = \mathbf{a}(z_0) = \mathbf{a}(z_1) = \cdots = \mathbf{a}(z_n) = \mathbf{a}(z)$. Applying P9 or P10 to z_{j-1}, z_j we obtain $z_{j-1} \sim_{\mathcal{L}} z_j$ or $z_{j-1} \sim_{\mathcal{R}} z_j$. Hence $z' \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} z$.

14.12. $P3, P4, P8$ for W and $W_I \implies P12$. We write $\mathbf{a}_I : W_I \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ for the $\mathbf{a}$ -function defined in terms of W_I . For $x, y, z \in W_I$, we write $h_{x,y,z}^I, \gamma_{x,y,z}^I$ for the analogues of $h_{x,y,z}, \gamma_{x,y,z}$ when W is replaced by W_I . Let $\mathcal{H}_I \subset \mathcal{H}$ be as in 9.9.

Let $d \in \mathcal{D}$ be such that $\gamma_{y^{-1},y,d} \neq 0$. (See P3.) Then $\pi_{\mathbf{a}(d)}(h_{y^{-1},y,d^{-1}}) \neq 0$. Now $c_{y^{-1}}c_y \in \mathcal{H}_I$ hence $d \in W_I$ and $\pi_{\mathbf{a}(d)}(h_{y^{-1},y,d^{-1}}^I) \neq 0$. Thus, $\mathbf{a}_I(d^{-1}) \geq \mathbf{a}(d^{-1})$. The reverse inequality is obvious hence $\mathbf{a}_I(d) = \mathbf{a}(d)$. We see that $\gamma_{y^{-1},y,d}^I \neq 0$. By P8 we see that $y \sim_{\mathcal{L}} d$ (relative to W_I) and $y \sim_{\mathcal{L}} d$ (relative to W). From P4 we deduce that $\mathbf{a}_I(y) = \mathbf{a}_I(d)$ and $\mathbf{a}(y) = \mathbf{a}(d)$. It follows that $\mathbf{a}(y) = \mathbf{a}_I(y)$.

14.13. $14.3, P2, P3, P4, P6, P8 \implies P13$. If $x \in \Gamma$ then, by P3, there exists $d \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\gamma_{x^{-1},x,d} \neq 0$. By P8 we have $x \sim_{\mathcal{L}} d^{-1}$ hence $d^{-1} \in \Gamma$. By P6, we have $d = d^{-1}$ hence $d \in \Gamma$. It remains to prove the uniqueness of d . Let d', d'' be elements of $\mathcal{D} \cap \Gamma$. We must prove that $d' = d''$. We can find x', y', x'', y'' such that $\gamma_{x',y',d'} \neq 0, \gamma_{x'',y'',d''} \neq 0$. By P2, we have $x' = y'^{-1}, x'' = y''^{-1}$. By P8, we have $y' \sim_{\mathcal{L}} d'^{-1} = d'$ and $y'' \sim_{\mathcal{L}} d''^{-1} = d''$, hence $y', y'' \in \Gamma$. By the definition of left cells, we can find a sequence $y' = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n = y''$ such that $x_{j-1} \leftarrow_{\mathcal{L}} x_j$ for $j \in [1, n]$. Since $y' \sim_{\mathcal{L}} y''$, we have $x_j \in \Gamma$ for all j . For each $j \in [1, n-1]$ let $d_j \in \mathcal{D}$ be such that $\gamma_{x_{j-1}^{-1},x_j,d_j} \neq 0$. Let $d_0 = d', d_n = d''$. As in the beginning of the proof, we have $d_j \in \Gamma$ for each j . Let $j \in [1, n]$. By P8, we have $\gamma_{x_j,d_j,x_j^{-1}} \neq 0$. Applying 14.3 to x_j, d_j, x_j, x_{j-1} instead of x, y, z, z' , we see that there exists u such that $\pi_{\mathbf{a}(x_j)}(h_{u,d_j,x_{j-1}}) \neq 0$. Since $x_{j-1} \sim x_j$, we have $\mathbf{a}(x_{j-1}) = \mathbf{a}(x_j)$ (see P4), hence $\pi_{\mathbf{a}(x_j)}(h_{u,d_j,x_{j-1}}) = \gamma_{u,d_j,x_{j-1}^{-1}} \neq 0$. Using P8, we deduce $\gamma_{x_{j-1}^{-1},u,d_j} \neq 0$. Using P2 we see that $u = x_{j-1}$ and $\gamma_{x_{j-1}^{-1},x_{j-1},d_j} \neq 0$. We have also $\gamma_{x_{j-1}^{-1},x_{j-1},d_{j-1}} \neq 0$ and by the uniqueness in P3, it follows that $d_{j-1} = d_j$. Since this holds for $j \in [1, n]$, it follows that $d' = d''$, as required.

14.14. $P6, P13 \implies P14$. By P13, we can find $d \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $z \sim_{\mathcal{L}} d$. Since $d = d^{-1}$ (see P6), it follows that $z^{-1} \sim_{\mathcal{R}} d$. Thus, $z \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} z^{-1}$.

14.15. In this subsection we reformulate conjecture P15, assuming that P4, P9, P10 hold. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \mathbf{Z}[v, v^{-1}, v', v'^{-1}]$ where v, v' are indeterminates. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be

the free $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ -module with basis $e_w (w \in W)$. Let $(\mathcal{H}', c'_w, h'_{x,y,z})$ be obtained from $(\mathcal{H}, c_w, h_{x,y,z})$ by changing the variable v to v' . In particular, $h'_{x,y,z} \in \mathbf{Z}[v', v'^{-1}]$.

On $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ we have a left $\mathcal{H}$ -module structure given by $v^n c_y e_w = \sum_x v^n h_{y,w,x} e_x$ and a right $\mathcal{H}'$ -module structure defined by $e_w (v'^n c'_y) = \sum_x v'^n h'_{w,y,x} e_x$. These module structures do not commute in general. For each $a \geq 0$ let $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\geq a}$ be the $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ -submodule of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ spanned by $\{e_w | \mathbf{a}(w) \geq a\}$. By P4, this is a left $\mathcal{H}$ -submodule and a right $\mathcal{H}'$ -submodule of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$. We have

$$\dots \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\geq 2} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\geq 1} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\geq 0} = \tilde{\mathcal{H}}$$

and $gr\tilde{\mathcal{H}} = \bigoplus_{a \geq 0} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\geq a} / \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\geq a+1}$ inherits a left $\mathcal{H}$ -module structure and a right $\mathcal{H}'$ -module structure from $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$. Clearly, P15 is equivalent to the condition that these module structures on $gr\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ commute. To check this last condition, it is enough to check that the actions of $c_s, c'_{s'}$ commute on $gr\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ whenever $s, s' \in S$. Let $s, s' \in S, w \in W$. A computation using 6.6, 6.7, 8.2 shows that $(c_s e_w) c'_{s'} - c_s (e_w c_{s'})$ is 0 if $sw < w$ or $ws' < w$, while if $sw > w, ws' > w$, it is

$$\sum_{y; sy < y, ys' < y} (h'_{w,s',y}(v_s + v_s^{-1}) - h_{s,w,y}(v'_{s'} + v'_{s'}^{-1}))e_y + \sum_{y; sy < y, ys' < y} \alpha_y e_y$$

where

$$\alpha_y = \sum_{y'; y's' < y' < sy'} h'_{w,s',y'} h_{s,y',y} - \sum_{y'; sy' < y' < y's'} h_{s,w,y'} h'_{y',s',y}.$$

If y satisfies $sy < y, ys' < y$ and either $h'_{w,s',y}$ or $h_{s,w,y}$ is $\neq 0$, then $\mathbf{a}(y) > \mathbf{a}(w)$. (We certainly have $\mathbf{a}(y) \geq \mathbf{a}(w)$ by P4. If we had $\mathbf{a}(y) = \mathbf{a}(w)$ and $h_{s,w,y} \neq 0$ then by P9 we would have $y \sim_{\mathcal{L}} w$ hence $\mathcal{R}(y) = \mathcal{R}(w)$ contradicting $ys' < y, ws' > w$. If we had $\mathbf{a}(y) = \mathbf{a}(w)$ and $h'_{w,s',y} \neq 0$ then by P10 we would have $y \sim_{\mathcal{R}} w$ hence $\mathcal{L}(y) = \mathcal{L}(w)$ contradicting $sy < y, sw > w$.) Hence, if $sw > w, ws' > w$, we have

$$(c_s e_w) c'_{s'} - c_s (e_w c_{s'}) = \sum_{y; sy < y, ys' < y, \mathbf{a}(y) = \mathbf{a}(w)} \alpha_y e_y \mod \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\geq \mathbf{a}(w)+1}.$$

We see that P15 is equivalent to the following statement.

(a) If $y, w \in W, s, s' \in S$ are such that $sw > w, ws' > w, sy < y, ys' < y, \mathbf{a}(y) = \mathbf{a}(w)$, then

$$\sum_{y'; y's' < y' < sy'} h'_{w,s',y'} h_{s,y',y} = \sum_{y'; sy' < y' < y's'} h_{s,w,y'} h'_{y',s',y}.$$

15. EXAMPLE: THE SPLIT CASE

15.1. In this section we assume that we are in the split case (see 3.1), that W is tame and that

- (a) $h_{x,y,z} \in \mathbf{N}[v, v^{-1}]$ for all x, y, z in W ,
- (b) $p_{y,w} \in \mathbf{N}[v^{-1}]$ for all y, w in W .

It is known that (a),(b) hold automatically in the split case if W is tame, integral.

Under these assumptions we will show that 14.3 and P1-P3 hold for W, l hence all of P1-P14 hold for W, l ; we will also show that P15 holds.

A reference for this section is [L4].

15.2. Proof of P1. The weaker inequality $\mathbf{a}(z) \leq l(z)$ was first proved in [L3] for finite W and then for general W by Springer (unpublished). The present argument was inspired by Springer's argument.

From 14.5(a) we see that for $x, y \in W$ we have

$$(a) \sum_z h_{x,y,z} p_{1,z} \in \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}].$$

From 15.1(a),(b) we see that $h_{x,y,z} p_{1,z} \in \mathbf{N}[v, v^{-1}]$ for any z . Hence in (a) there are no cancellations, so that

$$(b) h_{x,y,z} p_{1,z} \in \mathbf{N}[v^{-1}] \text{ for any } z.$$

We now fix z and choose x, y so that $\gamma_{x,y,z^{-1}} \neq 0$. From the definitions we have

$$(c) h_{x,y,z} p_{1,z} \in \gamma_{x,y,z^{-1}} n_z v^{\mathbf{a}(z) - \Delta(z)} + \text{strictly smaller powers of } v$$

and the coefficient of $v^{\mathbf{a}(z) - \Delta(z)}$ is $\neq 0$. Comparing with (b) we deduce that $\mathbf{a}(z) - \Delta(z) \leq 0$.

15.3. Proof of P2. Assume that $x \neq y^{-1}$. From 14.5(a) we see that

$$(a) \sum_z h_{x,y,z} p_{1,z} \in v^{-1} \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}].$$

As in 15.2, this implies (using 15.1(a),(b)) that

$$(b) h_{x,y,z} p_{1,z} \in v^{-1} \mathbf{N}[v^{-1}] \text{ for any } z.$$

Assume now that $z = d^{-1} \in \mathcal{D}$. The equality 15.2(c) becomes in our case

$$h_{x,y,z} p_{1,z} \in \gamma_{x,y,z^{-1}} n_z + v^{-1} \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}].$$

Comparing with (b) we deduce that $\gamma_{x,y,z^{-1}} n_z = 0$. Since $n_z \neq 0$, we have $\gamma_{x,y,z^{-1}} = 0$. This proves P2.

15.4. Proof of P3. From 14.5(a) we see that

$$(a) \sum_z h_{y^{-1},y,z} p_{1,z} \in 1 + v^{-1} \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}].$$

As in 15.2, this implies (using 15.1(a),(b)) that there is a unique z , say $z = d^{-1}$ such that

$$(b) h_{y^{-1},y,d^{-1}} p_{1,d^{-1}} \in 1 + v^{-1} \mathbf{N}[v^{-1}]$$

and that

$$(c) h_{y^{-1},y,z} p_{1,z} \in v^{-1} \mathbf{N}[v^{-1}]$$

for all $z \neq d^{-1}$. For $z = d^{-1}$, the equality 15.2(c) becomes

$$h_{y^{-1},y,d^{-1}} p_{1,d^{-1}} \in \gamma_{y^{-1},y,d} n_{d^{-1}} v^{\mathbf{a}(d) - \Delta(d)} + \text{strictly smaller powers of } v.$$

Here $\mathbf{a}(d) - \Delta(d) \leq 0$. Comparing with (b) we deduce that $\mathbf{a}(d) - \Delta(d) = 0$ and $\gamma_{y^{-1},y,d} n_{d^{-1}} = 1$. Thus, $d \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\gamma_{y^{-1},y,d} \neq 0$. Thus, the existence part of P3 is established.

Assume that there exists $d' \neq d$ such that $d' \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\gamma_{y^{-1},y,d'} \neq 0$. For $z = d'^{-1}$ the equality 15.2(c) becomes

$$h_{y^{-1},y,d'^{-1}} p_{1,d'^{-1}} \in \gamma_{y^{-1},y,d'} n_{d'^{-1}} + v^{-1} \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}].$$

Comparing with (c) (with $z = d'^{-1}$) we deduce that $\gamma_{y^{-1},y,d'} n_{d'^{-1}} = 0$ hence $\gamma_{y^{-1},y,d'} = 0$, a contradiction. This proves the uniqueness part of P3.

15.5. Proof of 14.3. We may assume that $z' \neq z$. Then we can find $s \in S$ such that $sz' < z'$, $sz > z$ and $h_{s,z,z'} \neq 0$. Since $h_{x,y,z} \neq 0$, we have (by 13.1(d)) $z \leq_{\mathcal{R}} x$ hence $\mathcal{L}(x) \subset \mathcal{L}(z)$ (by 8.6). Since $s \notin \mathcal{L}(z)$, we have $s \notin \mathcal{L}(x)$, that is, $sx > x$. We have $c_s c_x c_y = \sum_u p_u c_u$, where

$$p_u = \sum_w h_{x,y,w} h_{s,w,u} = \sum_{x'} h_{s,x,x'} h_{x',y,u}.$$

In particular,

$$p_{z'} = \sum_w h_{x,y,w} h_{s,w,z'} = h_{x,y,z} h_{s,z,z'} + \sum_{w; w \neq z} h_{x,y,w} h_{s,w,z'}.$$

By 6.5, we have $h_{s,z,z'} \in \mathbf{Z}$ hence, taking

$$(a) \quad \pi_n(p_{z'}) = \pi_n(h_{x,y,z}) h_{s,z,z'} + \sum_{w; w \neq z} \pi_n(h_{x,y,w} h_{s,w,z'}).$$

for any $n \in \mathbf{Z}$. In particular, this holds for $n = \mathbf{a}(z)$. By assumption, we have $\pi_n(h_{x,y,z}) \neq 0$ and $h_{s,z,z'} \neq 0$; hence, by 15.1(a), we have $\pi_n(h_{x,y,z}) > 0$ and $h_{s,z,z'} > 0$. Again, by 15.1(a) we have $\pi_n(h_{x,y,w} h_{s,w,z'}) \geq 0$ for any $w \neq z$. Hence from (a) we deduce $\pi_n(p_{z'}) > 0$. Since $p_{z'} = \sum_{x'} h_{s,x,x'} h_{x',y,z'}$, there exists x' such that $\pi_n(h_{s,x,x'} h_{x',y,z'}) \neq 0$. Since $sx > x$, we see from 6.5 that $h_{s,x,x'} \in \mathbf{Z}$ hence

$$\pi_n(h_{s,x,x'} h_{x',y,z'}) = h_{s,x,x'} \pi_n(h_{x',y,z'}).$$

Thus we have $\pi_n(h_{x',y,z'}) \neq 0$. This proves 14.3 in our case.

15.6. Since 14.3 and P1-P3 are known, we see that P1-P11 and P13,P14 hold in our case (see §14). The same arguments can be applied to W_I where $I \subset W$, hence P1-P11 and P13,P14 hold for W_I . By 14.12, P12 holds for W . Thus, P1-P14 hold for W .

15.7. Proof of P15. By 14.15, we see that it is enough to prove 14.15(a). Let y, w, s, s' be as in 14.15(a). In our case, by 6.5, the equation in 14.15(a) involves only integers, hence it is enough to prove it after specializing $v = v'$. If in 14.15 we specialize $v = v'$, then the left and right module structures in 14.15 clearly commute, since the left and right regular representations of $\mathcal{H}$ commute. Hence the coefficient of e_y in $((c_s e_w) c'_{s'} - c_s (e_w c_{s'}))_{v=v'}$ is 0. By the computation in 14.15, this coefficient is

$$(a) \quad (h_{w,s',y} - h_{s,w,y})(v + v^{-1}) + \sum_{\substack{y' \\ y's' < y' < sy'}} h_{w,s',y'} h_{s,y',y} - \sum_{\substack{y' \\ sy' < y' < y's'}} h_{s,w,y'} h_{y',s',y} = 0$$

By 6.5, $h_{s,w,y}$ is the coefficient of v^{-1} in $p_{y,w}$ and $h_{w,s',y} = h_{s',w^{-1},y^{-1}}$ is the coefficient of v^{-1} in $p_{y^{-1},w^{-1}} = p_{y,w}$. Thus, $h_{s,w,y} = h_{w,s',y}$ and (a) reduces to the equation in 14.15(a) (specialized at $v = v'$). This proves 14.15(a).

16. EXAMPLE: THE QUASISPLIT CASE

16.1. Let $(\tilde{W}, \tilde{S})$ be a Coxeter group and let $\sigma : \tilde{W} \rightarrow \tilde{W}$ be an automorphism of finite order of $\tilde{W}$ which restricts to a permutation of $\tilde{S}$ such that any σ -orbit on $\tilde{S}$ generates a finite subgroup of $\tilde{W}$. Assume also that the following condition is satisfied: if $s, s' \in S$ and $k \in \mathbf{N}$ are such that $m_{s,s'} \geq 4$ and σ^k maps $\{s, s'\}$ into itself then $\sigma^k(s) = s, \sigma^k(s') = s'$.

Let $\tilde{W}^\sigma = \{w \in \tilde{W} | \sigma(w) = w\}$. For any σ -orbit $\mathbf{o}$ on $\tilde{S}$, we set $s_{\mathbf{o}} = w_0^{\mathbf{o}} \in \tilde{W}^\sigma$. The elements $s_{\mathbf{o}}$ for various $\mathbf{o}$ as above form a subset $\tilde{S}_\sigma$ of $\tilde{W}^\sigma$.

Lemma 16.2. $(\tilde{W}^\sigma, \tilde{S}_\sigma)$ is a Coxeter group and the restriction to $\tilde{W}^\sigma$ of the length function $\tilde{l} : \tilde{W} \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ is a weight function $L : \tilde{W}^\sigma \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$.

We omit the proof.

16.3. In this section we assume that $\tilde{W}$ is tame, (W, S) is the Coxeter group $(\tilde{W}^\sigma, \tilde{S}_\sigma)$ and that $L : W \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ is as in 16.2. We then say that we are in the *quasisplit case*.

We denote $h_{x,y,z}, p_{x,y}, \mathbf{a}(z), \gamma_{x,y,z}, \Delta(z), \mathcal{D}$ defined in terms of $\tilde{W}, \tilde{l}$ by

$$\tilde{h}_{x,y,z}, \tilde{p}_{x,y}, \tilde{\mathbf{a}}(z), \tilde{\gamma}_{x,y,z}, \tilde{\Delta}(z), \tilde{\mathcal{D}}.$$

We shall assume that the following holds.

(a) For any $x, y, z \in \tilde{W}$ and any integer n there exists a $\mathbf{Q}$ -vector space $V_{x,y,z}^n$ such that $\tilde{h}_{x,y,z} = \sum_n \dim V_{x,y,z}^n v^n$; for any $x, y \in \tilde{W}$ and any integer $n \leq 0$ there exists a $\mathbf{Q}$ -vector space $V_{x,y}^n$ such that $\tilde{p}_{x,y} = \sum_{n \leq 0} \dim V_{x,y}^n v^n$.

In other words, $(\tilde{W}, \tilde{l})$ satisfies the requirements of 15.1. We shall further assume that the following holds.

(b) For any $x, y, z \in W$ and any integer n , $V_{x,y,z}^n$ carries a linear transformation σ of finite order and $h_{x,y,z} = \sum_n \text{tr}(\sigma, V_{x,y,z}^n) v^n$; for any $x, y \in W$ and any integer $n \leq 0$, $V_{x,y}^n$ carries a linear transformation σ of finite order and $p_{x,y} = \sum_n \text{tr}(\sigma, V_{x,y}^n) v^n$.

It is known that this is automatically satisfied if $\tilde{W}$ is tame, integral.

We deduce that (c)-(f) below hold:

- (c) If $x, y, z \in W, n \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $\pi_n(h_{x,y,z}) \neq 0$ then $\pi_n(\tilde{h}_{x,y,z}) \neq 0$.
- (d) If $x, y \in W, n \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $\pi_n(p_{x,y}) \neq 0$ then $\pi_n(\tilde{p}_{x,y}) \neq 0$.
- (e) If $x, y, z \in W, n \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $\pi_n(\tilde{h}_{x,y,z}) = \pm 1$ then $\pi_n(h_{x,y,z}) = \pm 1$.
- (f) If $x, y \in W, n \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $\pi_n(\tilde{p}_{x,y}) = \pm 1$ then $\pi_n(p_{x,y}) = \pm 1$.

16.4. By our assumptions, the results of §15 are applicable to $\tilde{W}, \tilde{l}$. Under the assumptions above, we will show that 14.3 and P1-P3 hold for W, L hence all of P1-P14 hold for W, L .

Lemma 16.5. For $z \in W$ we have $\mathbf{a}(z) = \tilde{\mathbf{a}}(z)$ and $\tilde{\Delta}(z) \leq \Delta(z)$.

We can find $x, y \in W$ such that $\pi_{\mathbf{a}(z)}(h_{x,y,z}) \neq 0$. By 16.3(c) we have $\pi_{\mathbf{a}(z)}(\tilde{h}_{x,y,z}) \neq 0$. Hence $\mathbf{a}(z) \leq \tilde{\mathbf{a}}(z)$. By P3, P5 for $\tilde{W}$, there is a unique $d \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ such that $\tilde{\gamma}_{z^{-1}, z, d} = \pm 1$. The uniqueness of d implies that d is fixed by σ . Thus $d \in W$. By P7 for $\tilde{W}$, we have $\tilde{\gamma}_{z, d, z^{-1}} = \pm 1$. Hence $\pi_{\tilde{\mathbf{a}}(z)}(\tilde{h}_{z, d, z}) = \pm 1$. By 16.3(e), we have $\pi_{\tilde{\mathbf{a}}(z)}(h_{z, d, z}) = \pm 1$. Hence $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}(z) \leq \mathbf{a}(z)$ so that $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}(z) = \mathbf{a}(z)$.

By definition, we have $\pi_{-\Delta(z)}(p_{1,z}) \neq 0$. Using 16.3(d), we deduce that $\pi_{-\Delta(z)}(\tilde{p}_{1,z}) \neq 0$. Hence $-\Delta(z) \leq -\tilde{\Delta}(z)$. The lemma is proved.

Lemma 16.6. $\mathcal{D} = \tilde{\mathcal{D}} \cap W$.

Let $d \in \mathcal{D}$. We have $\mathbf{a}(d) = \Delta(d)$. Using 16.5, we deduce $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}(d) = \Delta(d)$. By P1 for $\tilde{W}$, we have $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}(d) \leq \tilde{\Delta}(d)$. Hence $\Delta(d) \leq \tilde{\Delta}(d)$. Using 16.5, we deduce $\Delta(d) = \tilde{\Delta}(d)$ so that $\tilde{\Delta}(d) = \tilde{\mathbf{a}}(d)$ and $d \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}$.

Conversely, let $d \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}} \cap W$. We have $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}(d) = \tilde{\Delta}(d)$. Using 16.5 we deduce $\mathbf{a}(d) = \tilde{\Delta}(d)$. By P5 for $\tilde{W}$, we have $\pi_{-\tilde{\Delta}(d)}(\tilde{p}_{1,d}) = \pm 1$. Using 16.3(f) we deduce $\pi_{-\tilde{\Delta}(d)}(p_{1,d}) = \pm 1$. Hence $-\tilde{\Delta}(d) \leq -\Delta(d)$. Using 16.5 we deduce $\Delta(d) = \tilde{\Delta}(d)$ so that $\Delta(d) = \mathbf{a}(d)$ and $d \in \mathcal{D}$. The lemma is proved.

Lemma 16.7. (a) *Let $x, y, z \in W$ be such that $\gamma_{x,y,z} \neq 0$. Then $\tilde{\gamma}_{x,y,z} \neq 0$.*
 (b) *Let $x, y, z \in W$ be such that $\tilde{\gamma}_{x,y,z} = \pm 1$. Then $\gamma_{x,y,z} = \pm 1$.*

In the setup of (a) we have $\pi_{\mathbf{a}(z^{-1})}(h_{x,y,z^{-1}}) \neq 0$. Using 16.5 we deduce that $\pi_{\tilde{\mathbf{a}}(z^{-1})}(h_{x,y,z^{-1}}) \neq 0$. Using 16.3(c), we deduce that $\pi_{\tilde{\mathbf{a}}(z^{-1})}(\tilde{h}_{x,y,z^{-1}}) \neq 0$. Hence $\tilde{\gamma}_{x,y,z} \neq 0$.

In the setup of (b) we have $\pi_{\tilde{\mathbf{a}}(z^{-1})}(\tilde{h}_{x,y,z^{-1}}) = \pm 1$. Using 16.5, we deduce $\pi_{\mathbf{a}(z^{-1})}(\tilde{h}_{x,y,z^{-1}}) = \pm 1$. Using 16.3(e), we deduce $\pi_{\mathbf{a}(z^{-1})}(h_{x,y,z^{-1}}) = \pm 1$. Hence $\gamma_{x,y,z} = \pm 1$.

16.8. Proof of P1. By 16.5 and P1 for $\tilde{W}$, we have $\mathbf{a}(z) = \tilde{\mathbf{a}}(z) \leq \tilde{\Delta}(z) \leq \Delta(z)$, hence $\mathbf{a}(z) \leq \Delta(z)$.

16.9. Proof of P2. In the setup of P2, we have (by 16.7) $\tilde{\gamma}_{x,y,d} \neq 0$ and $d \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ (see 16.6). Using P2 for $\tilde{W}$, we deduce $x = y^{-1}$.

16.10. Proof of P3. Let $y \in W$. By P3 for $\tilde{W}$, there is a unique $d \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ such that $\tilde{\gamma}_{y^{-1},y,d} \neq 0$. By the uniqueness of d , we have $\sigma(d) = d$ hence $d \in W$. Using P5 for $\tilde{W}$, we see that $\tilde{\gamma}_{y^{-1},y,d} = \pm 1$. Using 16.7, we deduce $\gamma_{y^{-1},y,d} = \pm 1$. Since $d \in \mathcal{D}$ by 16.6, the existence part of P3 is established. Assume now that $d' \in \mathcal{D}$ satisfies $\gamma_{y^{-1},y,d'} \neq 0$. Using 16.7, we deduce $\tilde{\gamma}_{y^{-1},y,d'} \neq 0$. Since $d' \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ by 16.6, we can use the uniqueness in P3 for $\tilde{W}$ to deduce that $d = d'$. Thus P3 holds for W .

16.11. Proof of P4. We may assume that there exists $s \in S$ such that $h_{s,z,z'} \neq 0$ or $h_{z,s,z'} \neq 0$. In the first case, using 16.3(c), we deduce $\tilde{h}_{s,z,z'} \neq 0$. Hence $z' \leq_{\mathcal{L}} z$ (in $\tilde{W}$) and using P4 for $\tilde{W}$, we deduce that $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}(z') \geq \tilde{\mathbf{a}}(z)$. Using now 16.5, we see that $\mathbf{a}(z') \geq \mathbf{a}(z)$. The proof in the second case is entirely similar.

16.12. Now P5 is proved as in 14.5; P6 is proved as in 14.6; P7 is proved as in 14.7; P8 is proved as in 14.8; P12 is proved as in 14.12.

16.13. Proof of P13. If $z' \leftarrow_{\mathcal{L}} z$ in W , then there exists $s \in S$ such that $h_{s,z,z'} \neq 0$ hence, by 16.3(c), $\tilde{h}_{s,z,z'} \neq 0$, hence $z' \leq_{\mathcal{L}} z$ in $\tilde{W}$. It follows that

(a) $z' \leq_{\mathcal{L}} z$ (in W) implies $z' \leq_{\mathcal{L}} z$ (in $\tilde{W}$).

Hence

(b) $z' \sim_{\mathcal{L}} z$ (in W) implies $z' \sim_{\mathcal{L}} z$ (in $\tilde{W}$).

Thus any left cell of W is contained in a left cell of $\tilde{W}$.

In the setup of P13, let $\tilde{\Gamma}$ be the left cell of $\tilde{W}$ containing Γ . Let $x \in \Gamma$. By P3 for W , there exists $d \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\gamma_{x^{-1},x,d} \neq 0$. By P8 for W , we have $x \sim_{\mathcal{L}} d^{-1}$ hence $d^{-1} \in \Gamma$. Using P6 we have $d = d^{-1}$, hence $d \in \Gamma$. It remains to prove the uniqueness of d . Let d', d'' be elements of $\mathcal{D} \cap \Gamma$. We must prove that $d' = d''$.

Now d', d'' belong to $\tilde{\Gamma}$ and, by 16.6, are in $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$. Using P13 for $\tilde{W}$, it follows that $d' = d''$. Thus P13 holds for W .

Lemma 16.14. *Let $x, y \in W$. We have $x \sim_{\mathcal{L}} y$ (in W) if and only if $x \sim_{\mathcal{L}} y$ (in $\tilde{W}$).*

If $x \sim_{\mathcal{L}} y$ (in W) then $x \sim_{\mathcal{L}} y$ (in $\tilde{W}$), by 16.13(b).

Assume now that $x \sim_{\mathcal{L}} y$ (in $\tilde{W}$). Let $d, d' \in \mathcal{D}$ be such that $x \sim_{\mathcal{L}} d$ (in W) and $y \sim_{\mathcal{L}} d'$ (in W); see P13. By the first line of the proof we have $x \sim_{\mathcal{L}} d$ (in $\tilde{W}$) and $y \sim_{\mathcal{L}} d'$ (in $\tilde{W}$). Hence $d \sim_{\mathcal{L}} d'$ (in $\tilde{W}$). Since $d, d' \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}$, we deduce (using P13 for $\tilde{W}$) that $d = d'$. It follows that $x \sim_{\mathcal{L}} y$ (in W). The lemma is proved.

16.15. *Proof of P9.* We assume that $z' \leq_{\mathcal{L}} z$ (in W) and $\mathbf{a}(z') = \mathbf{a}(z)$. By 16.13(a), it follows that $z' \leq_{\mathcal{L}} z$ (in $\tilde{W}$) and, using 16.5, that $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}(z') = \tilde{\mathbf{a}}(z)$. Using now P9 in $\tilde{W}$, it follows that $z' \sim_{\mathcal{L}} z$ (in $\tilde{W}$). Using 16.14, we deduce that $z' \sim_{\mathcal{L}} z$ (in W).

16.16. Now P10 is proved as in 14.10; P11 is proved as in 14.11; P14 is proved as in 14.14.

16.17. Assuming that $(\tilde{W}, \tilde{S})$ is tame, integral, P15 can be shown to hold in our case. We sketch a proof which is almost (but not entirely) correct.

The proof of P15 given in 14.15, 15.7, can be refined to a proof of the following statement:

For any w, y, x, x' in $\tilde{W}$ and any k there exists a natural isomorphism of vector spaces

$$\oplus_{j+j'=k} \oplus_{y' \in \tilde{W}} V_{w,x',y'}^{j'} \otimes V_{x,y',y}^j \xrightarrow{\sim} \oplus_{j+j'=k} \oplus_{y' \in \tilde{W}} V_{x,w,y'}^j \otimes V_{y',x',y}^{j'}.$$

When $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}(w) = \tilde{\mathbf{a}}(y)$, this restricts to an isomorphism

$$\oplus_{y' \in \tilde{W}} V_{w,x',y'}^{j'} \otimes V_{x,y',y}^j \xrightarrow{\sim} \oplus_{y' \in \tilde{W}} V_{x,w,y'}^j \otimes V_{y',x',y}^{j'}$$

for any j, j' such that $j + j' = k$.

Assuming now that $w, y, x, x' \in W$ and taking traces of σ in both sides, we deduce

$$\sum_{y' \in W} \pi_{j'}(h_{w,x',y'}) \pi_j(h_{x,y',y}) = \sum_{y' \in W} \pi_j(h_{x,w,y'}) \pi_{j'}(h_{y',x',y})$$

(the summands corresponding to $y' \in \tilde{W} - W$ do not contribute to the trace) or equivalently

$$\sum_{y' \in W} h'_{w,x',y'} h_{x,y',y} = \sum_{y' \in W} h_{x,w,y'} h'_{y',x',y},$$

as required. (The actual proof is slightly more complicated since the direct sum decompositions are not natural, only certain filtrations attached to them are.)

17. EXAMPLE: THE INFINITE DIHEDRAL CASE

17.1. In this section we preserve the setup of 7.1. We assume that $m = \infty$ and that $L_2 > L_1$. We will show that P1-P15 hold in this case.

Let $\zeta = v^{L_2-L_1} + v^{L_1-L_2}$. For $a \in \{1, 2\}$, let $f_a = v^{L_a} + v^{-L_a}$. For $m, n \in \mathbf{Z}$ we define $\delta_{m < n}$ to be 1 if $m < n$ and to be 0 otherwise.

17.2. From 7.5, 7.6 we have for all $k' \in \mathbf{N}$:

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 c_{2_{k'}} &= c_{1_{k'+1}}, \\ c_2 c_{1_{k'}} &= c_{2_{k'+1}} + \delta_{k'>1} \zeta c_{2_{k'-1}} + \delta_{k'>3} c_{2_{k'-3}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 17.3. *For $k \geq 0, k' \geq 1$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} (a) \quad c_{2_{2k+1}} c_{2_{k'}} &= f_2 \sum_{u \in [0, k]; 2u \leq k'-1} c_{2_{2k+k'-4u}}, \\ (b) \quad c_{1_{2k+2}} c_{2_{k'}} &= f_2 \sum_{u \in [0, k]; 2u \leq k'-1} c_{1_{2k+k'+1-4u}}. \end{aligned}$$

Assume that $k = 0$. Using 17.2 we have $c_2 c_{2_{k'}} = f_2 c_{2_{k'}}$.

Assume now that $k = 1$. Using 17.2, we have $c_{2_3} = c_2 c_1 c_2 - \zeta c_2$. Using this and 17.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_{2_3} c_{2_{k'}} &= c_2 c_1 c_2 c_{2_{k'}} - \zeta c_2 c_{2_{k'}} = f_2 c_2 c_{1_{k'+1}} - f_2 \zeta c_{2_{k'}} \\ &= f_2 c_{2_{k'+2}} + f_2 \zeta c_{2_{k'}} + \delta_{k'>2} f_2 c_{2_{k'-2}} - f_2 \zeta c_{2_{k'}} = f_2 c_{2_{k'+2}} + \delta_{k'>2} f_2 c_{2_{k'-2}}, \end{aligned}$$

as required. We prove the equality in (a) for fixed k' , by induction on k . The cases $k = 0, 1$ are already known. If $k = 2$ then using 17.2, we have $c_{2_5} = c_2 c_1 c_{2_3} - \zeta c_{2_3} - c_{2_1}$. Using this, 17.2, and the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_{2_5} c_{2_{k'}} &= c_2 c_1 c_{2_3} c_{2_{k'}} - \zeta c_{2_3} c_{2_{k'}} - c_{2_1} c_{2_{k'}} \\ &= f_2 c_2 c_1 c_{2_{k'+2}} + \delta_{k'>2} f_2 c_2 c_1 c_{2_{k'-2}} - \zeta f_2 c_{2_{k'+2}} - \delta_{k'>2} \zeta f_2 c_{2_{k'-2}} - f_2 c_{2_{k'}} \\ &= f_2 c_2 c_{1_{k'+3}} + \delta_{k'>2} f_2 c_2 c_{1_{k'-1}} - \zeta f_2 c_{2_{k'+2}} - \delta_{k'>2} \zeta f_2 c_{2_{k'-2}} - f_2 c_{2_{k'}} \\ &= f_2 c_{2_{k'+4}} + f_2 \zeta c_{2_{k'+2}} + f_2 c_{2_{k'}} + \delta_{k'>2} f_2 c_{2_{k'}} + \delta_{k'>2} f_2 \zeta c_{2_{k'-2}} + \delta_{k'>4} f_2 c_{2_{k'-4}} \\ &\quad - \zeta f_2 c_{2_{k'+2}} - \delta_{k'>2} \zeta f_2 c_{2_{k'-2}} - f_2 c_{2_{k'}} = f_2 c_{2_{k'+4}} + \delta_{k'>2} f_2 c_{2_{k'}} + \delta_{k'>4} f_2 c_{2_{k'-4}}, \end{aligned}$$

as required. A similar argument applies for $k \geq 3$. This proves (a).

(b) is obtained by multiplying both sides of (a) by c_1 on the left. The proposition is proved.

Proposition 17.4. *For $k \geq 0, k' \geq 1$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} (a) \quad c_{2_{2k+1}} c_{1_{k'}} &= \sum_{u \in [0, 2k+2]} p_u c_{2_{k'+2k+1-2u}}, \\ (b) \quad c_{1_{2k+2}} c_{1_{k'}} &= \sum_{u \in [0, 2k+2]} p_u c_{1_{k'+2k+2-2u}}, \\ (c) \quad c_{1_{k'}}^{-1} c_{2_{2k+1}} &= \sum_{u \in [0, 2k+2]} p_u c_{2_{k'+2k+1-2u}}^{-1}, \\ (d) \quad c_{1_{k'}}^{-1} c_{1_{2k+2}} &= \sum_{u \in [0, 2k+2]} p_u c_{1_{k'+2k+1-2u}}^{-1}, \\ (e) \quad c_{2_{2k+2}} c_{1_{k'}} &= \sum_{u \in [0, 2k+2]} f_1 p_u c_{2_{k'+2k+1-2u}}, \\ (f) \quad c_{1_{2k+3}} c_{1_{k'}} &= \sum_{u \in [0, 2k+2]} f_1 p_u c_{1_{k'+2k+2-2u}}, \\ (g) \quad c_{1_1} c_{1_{k'}} &= f_1 c_{1_{k'}}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} p_0 &= 1, \quad p_{2k+2} = \delta_{k'>2k+3}, \\ p_u &= \delta_{k'>u} \zeta \text{ for } u = 1, 3, 5, \dots, 2k+1, \\ p_u &= \delta_{k'>u-1} + \delta_{k'>u+1} \text{ for } u = 2, 4, 6, \dots, 2k. \end{aligned}$$

We prove (a). For $k = 0$ the equality in (a) is $c_2 c_{1_{k'}} = c_{2_{k'+1}} + \delta_{k'>1} \zeta c_{2_{k'-1}} + \delta_{k'>3} c_{2_{k'-3}}$ which is contained in 17.2. Assume now that $k = 1$. Using $c_{2_3} =$

$c_2 c_1 c_2 - \zeta c_2$ and 17.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{2_3} c_{1_{k'}} &= c_2 c_1 c_2 c_{1_{k'}} - \zeta c_2 c_{1_{k'}} = c_2 c_1 c_2 c_{k'+1} + \delta_{k'>1} \zeta c_2 c_1 c_2 c_{k'-1} + \delta_{k'>3} c_2 c_1 c_2 c_{k'-3} \\
&\quad - \zeta c_{2_{k'+1}} - \delta_{k'>1} \zeta^2 c_{2_{k'-1}} - \delta_{k'>3} \zeta c_{2_{k'-3}} = c_2 c_{1_{k'+2}} + \delta_{k'>1} \zeta c_2 c_{1_{k'}} \\
&\quad + \delta_{k'>3} c_2 c_{1_{k'-2}} - \zeta c_{2_{k'+1}} - \delta_{k'>1} \zeta^2 c_{2_{k'-1}} - \delta_{k'>3} \zeta c_{2_{k'-3}} \\
&= c_{2_{k'+3}} + \zeta c_{2_{k'+1}} + \delta_{k'>1} c_{2_{k'-1}} + \delta_{k'>1} \zeta c_{2_{k'+1}} + \delta_{k'>1} \zeta^2 c_{2_{k'-1}} + \delta_{k'>3} \zeta c_{2_{k'-3}} \\
&\quad + \delta_{k'>3} c_{2_{k'-1}} + \delta_{k'>3} \zeta c_{2_{k'-3}} + \delta_{k'>5} c_{2_{k'-5}} - \zeta c_{2_{k'+1}} - \delta_{k'>1} \zeta^2 c_{2_{k'-1}} - \delta_{k'>3} \zeta c_{2_{k'-3}} \\
&= c_{2_{k'+3}} + \delta_{k'>1} \zeta c_{2_{k'+1}} + (\delta_{k'>1} + \delta_{k'>3}) c_{2_{k'-1}} + \delta_{k'>3} \zeta c_{2_{k'-3}} + \delta_{k'>5} c_{2_{k'-5}}, \blacksquare
\end{aligned}$$

as required.

We prove the equality in (a) for fixed k' , by induction on k . The cases $k = 0, 1$ are already known. Assume now that $k = 2$. Using $c_{2_5} = c_2 c_1 c_{2_3} - \zeta c_{2_3} - c_{2_1}$, 17.2, and the case $k = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{2_5} c_{1_{k'}} &= c_2 c_1 c_{2_3} c_{1_{k'}} - \zeta c_{2_3} c_{1_{k'}} - c_{2_1} c_{1_{k'}} \\
&= c_2 c_1 c_{2_{k'+3}} + \delta_{k'>1} \zeta c_2 c_1 c_{2_{k'+1}} + (\delta_{k'>1} + \delta_{k'>3}) c_2 c_1 c_{2_{k'-1}} + \delta_{k'>3} \zeta c_2 c_1 c_{2_{k'-3}} \\
&\quad + \delta_{k'>5} c_2 c_1 c_{2_{k'-5}} - \zeta c_{2_{k'+3}} - \delta_{k'>1} \zeta^2 c_{2_{k'+1}} - (\delta_{k'>1} + \delta_{k'>3}) \zeta c_{2_{k'-1}} \\
&\quad - \delta_{k'>3} \zeta^2 c_{2_{k'-3}} - \delta_{k'>5} \zeta c_{2_{k'-5}} - c_{2_{k'+1}} - \delta_{k'>1} \zeta c_{2_{k'-1}} - \delta_{k'>3} c_{2_{k'-3}} \\
&= c_2 c_{1_{k'+4}} + \delta_{k'>1} \zeta c_2 c_{1_{k'+2}} + (\delta_{k'>1} + \delta_{k'>3}) c_2 c_{1_{k'}} + \delta_{k'>3} \zeta c_2 c_{1_{k'-2}} \\
&\quad + \delta_{k'>5} c_2 c_{1_{k'-4}} - \zeta c_{2_{k'+3}} - \delta_{k'>1} \zeta^2 c_{2_{k'+1}} - (\delta_{k'>1} + \delta_{k'>3}) \zeta c_{2_{k'-1}} \\
&\quad - \delta_{k'>3} \zeta^2 c_{2_{k'-3}} - \delta_{k'>5} \zeta c_{2_{k'-5}} - c_{2_{k'+1}} - \delta_{k'>1} \zeta c_{2_{k'-1}} - \delta_{k'>3} c_{2_{k'-3}} \\
&= c_{2_{k'+5}} + \zeta c_{2_{k'+3}} + c_{2_{k'+1}} + \delta_{k'>1} \zeta c_{2_{k'+3}} + \delta_{k'>1} \zeta^2 c_{2_{k'+1}} + \delta_{k'>1} \zeta c_{2_{k'-1}} \\
&\quad + (\delta_{k'>1} + \delta_{k'>3}) c_{2_{k'+1}} + (\delta_{k'>1} + \delta_{k'>3}) \zeta c_{2_{k'-1}} + 2\delta_{k'>3} c_{2_{k'-3}} + \delta_{k'>3} \zeta c_{2_{k'-1}} \\
&\quad + \delta_{k'>3} \zeta^2 c_{2_{k'-3}} + \delta_{k'>5} \zeta c_{2_{k'-5}} + \delta_{k'>5} c_{2_{k'-3}} + \delta_{k'>5} \zeta c_{2_{k'-5}} + \delta_{k'>7} c_{2_{k'-7}} \\
&\quad - \zeta c_{2_{k'+3}} - \delta_{k'>1} \zeta^2 c_{2_{k'+1}} - (\delta_{k'>1} + \delta_{k'>3}) \zeta c_{2_{k'-1}} - \delta_{k'>3} \zeta^2 c_{2_{k'-3}} - \delta_{k'>5} \zeta c_{2_{k'-5}} \\
&\quad - c_{2_{k'+1}} - \delta_{k'>1} \zeta c_{2_{k'-1}} - \delta_{k'>3} c_{2_{k'-3}} \\
&= c_{2_{k'+5}} + \delta_{k'>1} \zeta c_{2_{k'+3}} + (\delta_{k'>1} + \delta_{k'>3}) c_{2_{k'+1}} + \delta_{k'>3} c_{2_{k'-3}} + \delta_{k'>3} \zeta c_{2_{k'-1}} \\
&\quad + \delta_{k'>5} c_{2_{k'-3}} + \delta_{k'>5} \zeta c_{2_{k'-5}} + \delta_{k'>7} c_{2_{k'-7}} \\
&= c_{2_{k'+5}} + \delta_{k'>1} \zeta c_{2_{k'+3}} + (\delta_{k'>1} + \delta_{k'>3}) c_{2_{k'+1}} \\
&\quad + \delta_{k'>3} \zeta c_{2_{k'-1}} + (\delta_{k'>3} + \delta_{k'>5}) c_{2_{k'-3}} + \delta_{k'>5} \zeta c_{2_{k'-5}} + \delta_{k'>7} c_{2_{k'-7}}.
\end{aligned}$$

A similar argument applies for $k \geq 4$. This proves (a).

(b) is obtained by multiplying both sides of (a) by c_1 on the left. (c),(d) are obtained by applying the involution in 3.4 to both sides of (a),(b). We prove (e). We have

$c_{2_{2k+2}} c_{1_{k'}} = c_{2_{2k+1}} c_1 c_{1_{k'}} = f_1 c_{2_{2k+1}} c_{1_{k'}}$
and the last expression can be computed from (a). This proves (e). Similarly, (f) follows from (b); (g) is a special case of 6.6. The proposition is proved.

17.5. From 7.4, 7.6 we see that the function $\Delta : W \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ has the following values:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(2_{2k}) &= kL_1 + kL_2, \\ \Delta(2_{2k+1}) &= -kL_1 + (k+1)L_2, \\ \Delta(1_1) &= L_1, \\ \Delta(1_{2k+1}) &= (k-1)L_1 + kL_2, \text{ if } k \geq 1, \\ \Delta(1_{2k}) &= kL_1 + kL_2.\end{aligned}$$

It follows that P1 holds and that $\mathcal{D}$ consists of the involutions $2_0 = 1_0, 2_1, 1_1, 1_3$. Thus, P6 holds.

The formulas in 17.3, 17.4 determine $h_{x,y,z}$ for all x, y, z except when $x = 1$ or $y = 1$, in which case $h_{1,y,z} = \delta_{y,z}$, $h_{x,1,z} = \delta_{x,z}$. From these formulas we see that the triples (x, y, d) with $d \in \mathcal{D}$, $\gamma_{x,y,d} \neq 0$ are:

$$(2_{2k+1}, 2_{2k+1}, 2_1), (1_{2k+2}, 2_{2k+2}, 1_3), (1_1, 1_1, 1_1), \\ (1, 1, 1), (2_{2k+2}, 1_{2k+2}, 2_1), (1_{2k+3}, 1_{2k+3}, 1_3),$$

where $k \geq 0$. This implies that P2, P3 hold. From the results in 8.8 we see that P4, P9, P13 hold. From 14.5 we see that P5 holds. From 14.7 we see that P7 holds. From 14.8 we see that P8 holds. From 14.10 we see that P10 holds. From 14.11 we see that P11 holds. From 14.12 we see that P12 holds. From 14.14 we see that P14 holds.

We now verify P15 in our case. With the notation in 14.15, it is enough to show that, if $a, b \in \{1, 2\}$, $w \in W$, $s_a w > w$, $ws_b > w$, then

$$(c_a e_w) c'_b - c_a (e_w c'_b) \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\geq \mathbf{a}(w)+1}.$$

Here $c_a = c_{s_a}$, $c'_b = c'_{s_b}$. If a or b is 1, then from 17.2 we have $(c_a e_w) c'_b - c_a (e_w c'_b) = 0$. Hence we may assume that $a = b = 2$ and $w = 1_{2k+1}$. Using 17.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned}c_2(e_{1_{2k+1}} c'_2) &= c_2(e_{1_{2k+2}} + \delta_{k>0}) \zeta' e_{1_{2k}} + \delta_{k>1} e_{1_{2k-2}} \\ &= e_{2_{2k+3}} + \zeta e_{2_{2k+1}} + \delta_{k>0} e_{2_{2k-1}} + \delta_{k>0} \zeta' e_{2_{2k+1}} + \delta_{k>0} \zeta \zeta' e_{2_{2k-1}} \\ &\quad + \delta_{k>1} \zeta' e_{2_{2k-3}} + \delta_{k>1} e_{2_{2k-1}} + \delta_{k>1} \zeta e_{2_{2k-3}} + \delta_{k>2} e_{2_{2k-5}} \\ &= e_{2_{2k+3}} + \zeta e_{2_{2k+1}} + \delta_{k>0} \zeta' e_{2_{2k+1}} + \delta_{k>0} e_{2_{2k-1}} + \delta_{k>1} e_{2_{2k-1}} \\ &\quad + \delta_{k>0} \zeta \zeta' e_{2_{2k-1}} + \delta_{k>1} (\zeta + \zeta') e_{2_{2k-3}} + \delta_{k>2} e_{2_{2k-5}}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}(c_2 e_{1_{2k+1}}) c'_2 &= e_{2_{2k+3}} + \zeta' e_{2_{2k+1}} + \delta_{k>0} \zeta e_{2_{2k+1}} + \delta_{k>0} e_{2_{2k-1}} + \delta_{k>1} e_{2_{2k-1}} \\ &\quad + \delta_{k>0} \zeta \zeta' e_{2_{2k-1}} + \delta_{k>1} (\zeta + \zeta') e_{2_{2k-3}} + \delta_{k>2} e_{2_{2k-5}}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$c_2(e_{1_{2k+1}} c'_2) - (c_2 e_{1_{2k+1}}) c'_2 = (\zeta - \zeta') (1 - \delta_{k>0}) e_{2_{2k+1}}.$$

If $k > 0$, the right hand side is zero. Thus we may assume that $k = 0$. In this case,

$$c_2(e_{1_1} c'_2) - (c_2 e_{1_1}) c'_2 = (\zeta - \zeta') e_{2_1}.$$

We have $\mathbf{a}(1_1) = L_1 < L_2 = \mathbf{a}(2_1)$. This completes the verification of P15 in our case.

18. THE RING J

18.1. *In this section we assume that W is tame and that P1-P15 in §14 are valid. A reference for this section is [L4].*

Theorem 18.2. *(a) W has only finitely many left cells.*

(b) W has only finitely many right cells.

(c) W has only finitely many two-sided cells.

(d) $\mathcal{D}$ is a finite set.

We prove (a). Since $\mathbf{a}(w)$ is bounded above it is enough to show that, for any $a \in \mathbf{N}$, $\mathbf{a}^{-1}(a)$ is a union of finitely many left cells. By P4, $\mathbf{a}^{-1}(a)$ is a union of left cells. Let $\mathcal{H}^1$ be the $\mathbf{Z}$ -algebra $\mathbf{Z} \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$ where $\mathbf{Z}$ is regarded as an $\mathcal{A}$ -algebra via $v \mapsto 1$. We write c_w instead of $1 \otimes c_w$. For any $a' \geq 0$ let $\mathcal{H}_{\geq a'}^1$ be the subgroup of $\mathcal{H}^1$ spanned by $\{c_w | \mathbf{a}(w) \geq a'\}$ (a two-sided ideal of $\mathcal{H}^1$, by P4). We have a direct sum decomposition

$$(e) \mathcal{H}_{\geq a}^1 / \mathcal{H}_{\geq a+1}^1 = \bigoplus_{\Gamma} E_{\Gamma}$$

where Γ runs over the left cells contained in $\mathbf{a}^{-1}(a)$ and E_{Γ} is generated as a group by the images of $c_w, w \in \Gamma$; these images form a $\mathbf{Z}$ -basis of E_{Γ} . Now $\mathcal{H}_{\geq a}^1 / \mathcal{H}_{\geq a+1}^1$ inherits a left $\mathcal{H}^1$ -module structure from $\mathcal{H}^1$ and (by P9) each E_{Γ} is a $\mathcal{H}^1$ -submodule. Since W is tame, there exists a finitely generated abelian subgroup W_1 of finite index of W . Now $\mathcal{H}^1 = \mathbf{Z}[W]$ contains $\mathbf{Z}[W_1]$ as a subring. Since $\mathcal{H}_{\geq a}^1 / \mathcal{H}_{\geq a+1}^1$ is a subquotient of $\mathcal{H}^1$ (a finitely generated $\mathbf{Z}[W_1]$ -module) and $\mathbf{Z}[W_1]$ is a noetherian ring, it follows that $\mathcal{H}_{\geq a}^1 / \mathcal{H}_{\geq a+1}^1$ is a finitely generated $\mathbf{Z}[W_1]$ -module. Hence in the direct sum decomposition (e) with only non-zero summands, the number of summands must be finite. This proves (a).

Since any right cell is of the form Γ^{-1} where Γ is a left cell, we see that (b) follows from (a). Since any two-sided cell is a union of left cells, we see that (c) follows from (a). From P16 we see that (d) follows from (a). The theorem is proved.

18.3. Let J be the free abelian group with basis $(t_w)_{w \in W}$. We define

$$t_x t_y = \sum_{z \in W} \gamma_{x,y,z^{-1}} t_z.$$

The sum is finite since $\gamma_{x,y,z^{-1}} \neq 0 \implies h_{x,y,z} \neq 0$ and this implies that z runs through a finite set (for fixed x, y). We show that this defines an (associative) ring structure on J . We must check the identity

$$(a) \sum_z \gamma_{x,y,z^{-1}} \gamma_{z,u,u'^{-1}} = \sum_w \gamma_{y,u,w^{-1}} \gamma_{x,w,u'^{-1}}$$

for any $x, y, u, u' \in W$. From P8, P4 we see that both sides of (a) are 0 unless

$$(b) \mathbf{a}(x) = \mathbf{a}(y) = \mathbf{a}(u) = \mathbf{a}(u') = a$$

for some $a \in \mathbf{N}$. Hence we may assume that (b) holds. By P8, P4, in the first sum

in (a) we may assume that $\mathbf{a}(z) = a$ and in the second sum in (a) we may assume that $\mathbf{a}(w) = a$. The equation $(c_x c_y) c_u = c_x (c_y c_u)$ in $\mathcal{H}$ implies

$$(c) \quad \sum_z h_{x,y,z} h_{z,u,u'} = \sum_w h_{y,u,w} h_{x,w,u'}.$$

If $h_{x,y,z} h_{z,u,u'} \neq 0$ then $u' \leq_{\mathcal{R}} z \leq_{\mathcal{R}} x$ hence, by P4, $\mathbf{a}(u') \geq \mathbf{a}(z) \geq \mathbf{a}(x)$ and $\mathbf{a}(z) = a$. Hence in the first sum in (c) we may assume that $\mathbf{a}(z) = a$. Similarly in the second sum in (c) we may assume that $\mathbf{a}(w) = a$. Taking the coefficient of $v^{2\mathbf{a}(z)}$ in both sides of (c) we find (a).

The ring J has a unit element $\sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} n_d t_d$. Here $n_d = \pm 1$ is as in 14.1(a), see P5. (The sum is well defined by 18.2(d).) Let us check that $t_x \sum_d t_d = t_x$ for $x \in W$. This is equivalent to the identity $\sum_d n_d \gamma_{x,d,z^{-1}} = \delta_{z,x}$. By P7 this is equivalent to $\sum_d n_d \gamma_{z^{-1},x,d} = \delta_{z,x}$. This follows from P2,P3,P5. The equality $(\sum_d t_d) t_x = t_x$ is checked in a similar way.

For any subset X of W , let J^X be the subgroup of J generated by $\{t_x | x \in X\}$. If $\mathbf{c}$ is a two-sided cell of W, L then, by P8, $J^{\mathbf{c}}$ is a subring of J and $J = \bigoplus_{\mathbf{c}} J^{\mathbf{c}}$ is a direct sum decomposition of J as a ring. The unit element of $J^{\mathbf{c}}$ is $\sum_{d \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathbf{c}} t_d$. Similarly if Γ is a left cell of W, L then $J^{\Gamma \cap \Gamma^{-1}}$ is a subring of J with unit element t_d where $d \in \mathcal{D} \cap \Gamma$.

Proposition 18.4. *Assume that we are in the setup of 15.1. Let $x, y \in W$.*

(a) *The condition $x \sim_{\mathcal{L}} y$ is equivalent to the condition that $t_x t_{y^{-1}} \neq 0$ and to the condition that, for some u , t_y appears with $\neq 0$ coefficient in $t_u t_x$.*

(b) *The condition $x \sim_{\mathcal{R}} y$ is equivalent to the condition that $t_{x^{-1}} t_y \neq 0$ and to the condition that, for some u , t_y appears with $\neq 0$ coefficient in $t_x t_u$.*

(c) *The condition $x \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} y$ is equivalent to the condition that $t_x t_u t_y \neq 0$ for some u and to the condition that, for some u, u' , t_y appears with $\neq 0$ coefficient in $t_u t_x t_u$.*

Let $J^+ = \sum_z \mathbf{N} t_z$. By 15.1(a) we have $J^+ J^+ \subset J^+$.

We prove (a). The second condition is equivalent to $\gamma_{x,y^{-1},u} \neq 0$ for some u ; the third condition is equivalent to $\gamma_{x,u,y^{-1}} \neq 0$ for some u . These conditions are equivalent by P7.

Assume that $\gamma_{x,y^{-1},u} \neq 0$ for some u . Using P8 we deduce that $x \sim_{\mathcal{L}} y$.

Assume now that $x \sim_{\mathcal{L}} y$. Let $d \in \mathcal{D}$ be such that $x \sim_{\mathcal{L}} d$. Then we have also $y \sim_{\mathcal{L}} d$. By P13 we have $\gamma_{x^{-1},x,d} \neq 0$, $\gamma_{y^{-1},y,d} \neq 0$. Hence $\gamma_{x^{-1},x,d} = 1$, $\gamma_{y^{-1},y,d} = 1$. Hence $t_{x^{-1}} t_x \in t_d + J^+$, $t_{y^{-1}} t_y \in t_d + J^+$. Since $t_d t_d = t_d$, it follows that $t_{x^{-1}} t_x t_{y^{-1}} t_y \in t_d t_d + J^+ = t_d + J^+$. In particular, $t_x t_{y^{-1}} \neq 0$. This proves (a).

The proof of (b) is entirely similar.

We prove (c). Using the associativity of J we see that the third condition on x, y is a transitive relation on W . Hence to prove that the first condition implies the third condition we may assume that either $x \sim_{\mathcal{L}} y$ or $x \sim_{\mathcal{R}} y$, in which case this follows from (a) or (b). The fact that the third condition implies the first condition also follows from (a),(b). Thus the first and third condition are equivalent.

Assume that $t_x t_u t_y \neq 0$ for some u . By (a),(b) we then have $x \sim_{\mathcal{L}} u^{-1}, u^{-1} \sim_{\mathcal{R}} y$. Hence $x \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} y$.

Conversely, assume that $x \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} y$. Using P14 we deduce that $x \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} y^{-1}$. By the earlier part of the proof, $t_{y^{-1}}$ appears with $\neq 0$ coefficient in $t_{u'} t_x t_u$ for some u, u' . We have $t_{u'} t_x t_u \in at_{y^{-1}} + J^+$ where $a > 0$. Hence $t_{u'} t_x t_u t_y \in at_{y^{-1}} t_y + J^+$. Since $t_{y^{-1}} t_y$ has a coefficient 1 and the other coefficients are ≥ 0 , it follows that $t_{u'} t_x t_u t_y \neq 0$. Thus, $t_x t_u t_y \neq 0$. We see that the first and second conditions are equivalent. The proposition is proved.

18.5. Assume now that we are in the setup of 7.1 with $m = \infty$ and $L_2 > L_1$. From the formulas in 17.3, 17.4 we can determine the multiplication table of J . We find

$$\begin{aligned} t_{2k+1} t_{2k'+1} &= \sum_{u \in [0, \tilde{k}]} t_{2k+2k'+1-4u}, \\ t_{1_{2k+3}} t_{1_{2k'+3}} &= \sum_{u \in [0, \tilde{k}]} t_{1_{2k+2k'+3-4u}}, \\ t_{2k+1} t_{2k'+2} &= \sum_{u \in [0, \tilde{k}]} t_{2k+2k'+2-4u}, \\ t_{1_{2k+3}} t_{1_{2k'+2}} &= \sum_{u \in [0, \tilde{k}]} t_{1_{2k+2k'+2-4u}}, \\ t_{2k+2} t_{1_{2k'+3}} &= \sum_{u \in [0, \tilde{k}]} t_{2k+2k'+2-4u}, \\ t_{2k+2} t_{1_{2k'+2}} &= \sum_{u \in [0, \tilde{k}]} t_{2k+2k'+1-4u}, \\ t_{1_{2k+2}} t_{2k'+1} &= \sum_{u \in [0, \tilde{k}]} t_{1_{2k+2k'+2-4u}}, \\ t_{1_{2k+2}} t_{2k'+2} &= \sum_{u \in [0, \tilde{k}]} t_{1_{2k+2k'+3-4u}}, \\ t_{1_1} t_{1_1} &= t_{1_1}, \\ t_1 t_1 &= t_1; \end{aligned}$$

here $k, k' \geq 0$ and $\tilde{k} = \min(k, k')$. All other products are 0.

Let R be the free abelian group with basis $(b_k)_{k \in \mathbf{N}}$. We regard R as a commutative ring with multiplication

$$b_k b_{k'} = \sum_{u \in [0, \min(k, k')]} b_{k+k'-2u}.$$

Let $J_0 = \sum_{w \in W - \{1, 1_1\}} \mathbf{Z} t_w$. The formulas above show that $J = J_0 \oplus \mathbf{Z} t_1 \oplus \mathbf{Z} t_{1_1}$ (direct sum of rings) and that the ring J_0 is isomorphic to the ring of 2×2 matrices with entries in R , via the isomorphism defined by:

$$t_{2k+1} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} b_k & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad t_{1_{2k+3}} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b_k \end{pmatrix}, \quad t_{2k+2} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b_k \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad t_{1_{2k+2}} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ b_k & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that R is canonically isomorphic to the representation ring of $SL_2(\mathbf{C})$ with its canonical basis consisting of irreducible representations.

18.6. Assume that we are in the setup of 7.1 with $m = \infty$ and $L_2 = L_1$. By methods similar (but simpler) to those of §17 and 18.5, we find

$$t_{2k+1} t_{2k'+1} = \sum_{u \in [0, 2 \min(k, k')]} t_{2k+2k'+1-2u}.$$

Let J^1 be the subring of J generated by $t_{2k+1}, k \in \mathbf{N}$. While, in 18.5, the analogue of J^1 was isomorphic to R as a ring with basis, in the present case, J^1 is canonically isomorphic to R' , the subgroup of R generated by b_k with k even. (Note that R' is a subring of R , naturally isomorphic to the representation ring of $PGL_2(\mathbf{C})$.)

18.7. In the setup of 7.1 with $m = 4$ and $L_2 = 2, L_1 = 1$ (a special case of the situation in §15), we have

$J = \mathbf{Z}t_1 \oplus \mathbf{Z}t_{1_1} \oplus J_0 \oplus \mathbf{Z}t_{2_3} \oplus \mathbf{Z}t_{2_4}$
(direct sum of rings) where J_0 is the subgroup of J generated by $t_{2_1}, t_{2_2}, t_{1_2}, t_{1_3}$. The ring J_0 is isomorphic to the ring of 2×2 matrices with entries in $\mathbf{Z}$, via the isomorphism defined by:

$$t_{2_1} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad t_{1_3} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad t_{2_2} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad t_{1_2} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Moreover, t_1, t_{1_1}, t_{2_4} are idempotent. On the other hand,

$$t_{2_3}t_{2_3} = -t_{2_3}.$$

Notice the minus sign! (It is a special case of the computation in)

18.8. For any $z \in W$ we set $\hat{n}_z = n_d$ where d is the unique element of $\mathcal{D}$ such that $d \sim_{\mathcal{L}} z^{-1}$ and $n_d = \pm 1$ is as in 14.1(a), see P5. Note that $z \mapsto \hat{n}_z$ is constant on right cells.

Theorem 18.9. Let $J_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A} \otimes J$ and let $\phi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow J_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the $\mathcal{A}$ -linear map given by

$$\phi(c_x^\dagger) = \sum_{z \in W, d \in \mathcal{D}; \mathbf{a}(d) = \mathbf{a}(z)} h_{x,d,z} \hat{n}_z t_z$$

for all $x \in W$. Then ϕ is a homomorphism of $\mathcal{A}$ -algebras with 1.

Consider the equality

(a) $\sum_w h_{x_1,x_2,w} h'_{w,x_3,y} = \sum_w h_{x_1,w,y} h'_{x_2,x_3,w}$
(see P15) with $\mathbf{a}(x_2) = \mathbf{a}(y) = a$. In the left hand side we may assume that $y \leq_{\mathcal{R}} w \leq_{\mathcal{L}} x_2$ hence (by P4) $\mathbf{a}(y) \geq \mathbf{a}(w) \geq \mathbf{a}(x_2)$, hence $\mathbf{a}(w) = a$. Similarly in the right hand side we may assume that $\mathbf{a}(w) = a$. Picking the coefficient of v'^a in both sides of (a) gives

$$(b) \sum_w h_{x_1,x_2,w} \gamma_{w,x_3,y^{-1}} = \sum_w h_{x_1,w,y} \gamma_{x_2,x_3,w^{-1}}.$$

Let $x, x' \in W$. The desired identity $\phi(c_x^\dagger c_{x'}^\dagger) = \phi(c_x^\dagger) \phi(c_{x'}^\dagger)$ is equivalent to

$$\sum_{\substack{w \in W, d \in \mathcal{D} \\ \mathbf{a}(d) = a'}} h_{x,x',w} h_{w,d,u} \hat{n}_u = \sum_{\substack{z, z' \in W, d, d' \in \mathcal{D} \\ \mathbf{a}(d) = \mathbf{a}(z) \\ \mathbf{a}(d') = \mathbf{a}(z')}} h_{x,d,z} h_{x',d',z'} \gamma_{z,z',u^{-1}} \hat{n}_z \hat{n}_{z'}$$

for any $u \in W$ such that $\mathbf{a}(u) = a'$. In the right hand we may assume that

$\mathbf{a}(d) = \mathbf{a}(z) = \mathbf{a}(d') = \mathbf{a}(z') = a'$ and $\hat{n}_z = \hat{n}_u$
(by P8, P4). Hence the right hand side can be rewritten (using (b)):

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{z' \in W, d, d' \in \mathcal{D} \\ \mathbf{a}(d) = \mathbf{a}(d') = \mathbf{a}(z') = a'}} h_{x',d',z'} \sum_{z; \mathbf{a}(z) = a'} h_{x,d,z} \gamma_{z,z',u^{-1}} \hat{n}_u \hat{n}_{z'} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{z' \in W, d, d' \in \mathcal{D} \\ \mathbf{a}(d) = \mathbf{a}(d') = \mathbf{a}(z') = a'}} h_{x',d',z'} \sum_{w; \mathbf{a}(w) = a'} h_{x,w,u} \gamma_{d,z',w^{-1}} \hat{n}_u \hat{n}_{z'}. \end{aligned}$$

By P2,P3,P5, this equals

$$\sum_{z' \in W, d' \in \mathcal{D}; \mathbf{a}(d') = \mathbf{a}(z') = a'} h_{x', d', z'} h_{x, z', u} \hat{n}_u$$

which by the identity $(c_x c_{x'}) c_{d'} = c_x (c_{x'} c_{d'})$ equals

$$\sum_{w \in W, d' \in \mathcal{D}; \mathbf{a}(d') = a'} h_{x, x', w} h_{w, d', u} \hat{n}_u.$$

Thus ϕ is compatible with multiplication.

Next we show that ϕ is compatible with the unit elements of the two algebras. An equivalent statement is that for any $z \in W$ such that $\mathbf{a}(z) = a$, the sum $\sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}; \mathbf{a}(d) = a} h_{1, d, z} \hat{n}_z$ equals n_z if $z \in \mathcal{D}$ and is 0 if $z \notin \mathcal{D}$. This is clear since $h_{1, d, z} = \delta_{z, d}$.

18.10. If we identify the $\mathcal{A}$ -modules $\mathcal{H}$ and $J_{\mathcal{A}}$ via $c_w^\dagger \mapsto \hat{n}_w t_w$, the obvious left $J_{\mathcal{A}}$ -module structure on $J_{\mathcal{A}}$ becomes the left $J_{\mathcal{A}}$ -module structure on $\mathcal{H}$ given by

$$t_x * c_w^\dagger = \sum_{z \in W} \gamma_{x, w, z^{-1}} \hat{n}_w \hat{n}_z c_z^\dagger$$

Let $\mathcal{H}_a = \oplus_{w; \mathbf{a}(w) = a} \mathcal{A} c_w^\dagger$, $\mathcal{H}_{\geq a} = \oplus_{w; \mathbf{a}(w) \geq a} \mathcal{A} c_w^\dagger$. Note that $t_x * c_w^\dagger \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{a}(w)}$ for all x, w . For any $h \in \mathcal{H}$, $w \in W$ we have

$$(a) \quad h c_w^\dagger = \phi(h) * c_w^\dagger \mod \mathcal{H}_{\geq \mathbf{a}(w) + 1}.$$

Indeed, we may assume that $h = c_x^\dagger$. Using 18.9(b), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(c_x^\dagger) * c_w^\dagger &= \sum_{\substack{d \in \mathcal{D}, z \\ \mathbf{a}(d) = \mathbf{a}(z)}} h_{x, d, z} \hat{n}_z t_z * c_w^\dagger \\ &= \sum_{\substack{d \in \mathcal{D}, z, u \\ \mathbf{a}(d) = \mathbf{a}(z)}} h_{x, d, z} \gamma_{z, w, u^{-1}} \hat{n}_z \hat{n}_w \hat{n}_u c_u^\dagger = \sum_{\substack{d \in \mathcal{D}, z, u \\ \mathbf{a}(d) = \mathbf{a}(w) = \mathbf{a}(u)}} h_{x, d, z} \gamma_{z, w, u^{-1}} \hat{n}_w c_u^\dagger \\ &= \sum_{\substack{d \in \mathcal{D}, t, u \\ \mathbf{a}(d) = \mathbf{a}(w) = \mathbf{a}(u)}} h_{x, t, u} \gamma_{d, w, t^{-1}} \hat{n}_w c_u^\dagger = \sum_{\substack{d \in \mathcal{D}, u \\ \mathbf{a}(d) = \mathbf{a}(w) = \mathbf{a}(u)}} h_{x, w, u} \gamma_{d, w, w^{-1}} \hat{n}_w c_u^\dagger \\ &= \sum_{\substack{u \\ \mathbf{a}(w) = \mathbf{a}(u)}} h_{x, w, u} c_u^\dagger = c_x^\dagger c_w^\dagger \mod \mathcal{H}_{\geq \mathbf{a}(w) + 1}, \end{aligned}$$

as required.

18.11. Let $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow R$ be a ring homomorphism of $\mathcal{A}$ into a commutative ring R with 1. Let $\mathcal{H}_R = R \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}$, $J_R = R \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} (J_{\mathcal{A}}) = R \otimes J$, $\mathcal{H}_{R, \geq a} = R \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}_{\geq a}$. Then ϕ extends to a homomorphism of R -algebras $\phi_R : \mathcal{H}_R \rightarrow J_R$. The $J_{\mathcal{A}}$ -module in 18.10 extends to a $J_{\mathcal{A}}$ -module structure on $\mathcal{H}_R$ denoted again by $*$. From 18.10(a) we deduce

$$(a) \quad h c_w^\dagger = \phi_R(h) * c_w^\dagger \mod \mathcal{H}_{R, \geq \mathbf{a}(w) + 1} \text{ for any } h \in \mathcal{H}_R, w \in W.$$

Proposition 18.12. (a) If N is a bound for W, L , then $(\ker \phi_R)^{N+1} = 0$.

(b) If $R = R_0[v, v^{-1}]$ where R_0 is a commutative ring with 1, v is an indeterminate and $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow R$ is the obvious ring homomorphism, then $\ker \phi_R = 0$.

We prove (a). If $h \in \ker \phi_R$ then by 18.11(a), we have $h\mathcal{H}_{R, \geq a} \subset \mathcal{H}_{R, \geq a+1}$ for any $a \geq 0$. Applying this repeatedly, we see that, if $h_1, h_2, \dots, h_{N+1} \in \mathcal{H}$, we have $h_1 h_2 \dots h_{N+1} \in \mathcal{H}_{R, \geq N+1} = 0$. This proves (a).

We prove (b). Let $h = \sum_x p_x c_x^\dagger \in \ker \phi_R$ where $p_x \in R$. Assume that $h \neq 0$. Then $p_x \neq 0$ for some x . We can find $a \geq 0$ such that $p_x \neq 0 \implies \mathbf{a}(x) \geq a$ and $X = \{x \in W \mid p_x \neq 0, \mathbf{a}(x) = a\}$ is non-empty. We can find $b \in \mathbf{Z}$ such that $p_x \in v^b \mathbf{Z}[v^{-1}]$ for all $x \in X$ and such that $X' = \{x \in X \mid \pi_b(p_x) \neq 0\}$ is non-empty. Let $x_0 \in X'$. We can find $d \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\gamma_{x_0, d, x_0^{-1}} = \gamma_{x_0^{-1}, x_0, d} \neq 0$. We have $h c_d^\dagger = \sum_x p_x c_x^\dagger c_d^\dagger$. If $\mathbf{a}(x) > a$, then $c_x^\dagger c_d^\dagger \in \mathcal{H}_{R, \geq a+1}$. Hence $h c_d^\dagger = \sum_{x \in X} p_x c_x^\dagger c_d^\dagger \pmod{\mathcal{H}_{R, \geq a+1}}$. Since $\phi_R(h) = 0$, from 18.11(a) we have $h c_d^\dagger \in \mathcal{H}_{R, \geq a+1}$. It follows that $\sum_{x \in X} p_x c_x^\dagger c_d^\dagger \in \mathcal{H}_{R, \geq a+1}$. In particular the coefficient of $c_{x_0}^\dagger$ in $\sum_{x \in X} p_x c_x^\dagger c_d^\dagger$ is 0. In other words, $\sum_{x \in X} p_x h_{x, d, x_0} = 0$. The coefficient of v^{a+b} in the last sum is

$$\sum_{x \in X} \pi_b(p_x) \gamma_{x, d, x_0^{-1}} = \pi_b(p_{x_0}) \gamma_{x_0, d, x_0^{-1}}$$

and this is on the one hand 0 and on the other hand is non-zero since $\pi_b(p_{x_0}) \neq 0$ and $\gamma_{x_0, d, x_0^{-1}} \neq 0$, by the choice of x_0, d . This contradiction completes the proof.

19. ALGEBRAS WITH TRACE FORM

19.1. Let R be a field and let A be an associative R -algebra with 1 of finite dimension over R . We assume that A is semisimple and split over R and that we are given a *trace form* on A that is, an R -linear map $\tau : A \rightarrow R$ such that $(a, a') = \tau(aa') = \tau(a'a)$ is a non-degenerate (symmetric) R -bilinear form $(\cdot, \cdot) : A \times A \rightarrow R$. Note that $(aa', a'') = (a, a'a'')$ for all a, a', a'' in A . Let $\text{Mod} A$ be the category whose objects are left A -modules of finite dimension over R . We write $E \in \text{Irr} A$ for " E is a simple object of $\text{Mod} A$ ".

Let $(a_i)_{i \in I}$ be an R -basis of A and let $(a'_i)_{i \in I}$ be the R -basis defined by $(a_i, a'_j) = \delta_{ij}$. Then

(a) $\sum_i a_i \otimes a'_i \in A \otimes A$ is independent of the choice of (a_i) .

Proposition 19.2. (a) We have $\sum_i \tau(a_i) a'_i = 1$.

(b) If $E \in \text{Irr} A$, then $\sum_i \text{tr}(a_i, E) a'_i$ is in the centre of A . It acts on E as a scalar $f_E \in R$ times the identity and on $E' \in \text{Irr} A$, not isomorphic to E , as zero. Moreover, f_E does not depend on the choice of (a_i) .

(c) One can attach uniquely to each $E \in \text{Irr} A$ a scalar $g_E \in R$ (depending only on the isomorphism class of E), so that

$$\sum_E g_E \text{tr}(a, E) = \tau(a) \text{ for all } a \in A,$$

where the sum is taken over all $E \in \text{Irr} A$ up to isomorphism.

(d) For any $E \in \text{Irr} A$ we have $f_E g_E = 1$. In particular, $f_E \neq 0, g_E \neq 0$.

(e) If $E, E' \in \text{Irr} A$, then $\sum_i \text{tr}(a_i, E) \text{tr}(a'_i, E')$ is $f_E \dim E$ if E, E' are isomorphic and is 0, otherwise.

Let $A = \bigoplus_{n=1}^t A_n$ be the decomposition of A as a sum of simple algebras. Let $\tau_n : A_n \rightarrow R$ be the restriction of τ . Then τ_n is a trace form for A_n , whose associated form is the restriction of $(,)$ and $(A_n, A_{n'}) = 0$ for $n \neq n'$. Hence we can choose (a_i) so that each a_i is contained in some A_n and then a'_i will be contained in the same A_n as a'_i .

We prove (a). From 19.1(a) we see that $\sum_i \tau(a_i) a'_i$ is independent of the choice of (a_i) . Hence we may choose (a_i) as in the first paragraph of the proof. We are thus reduced to the case where A is simple. In that case the assertion is easily verified.

We prove (b). From 19.1(a) we see that $\sum_i \text{tr}(a_i, E) a'_i$ is independent of the choice of (a_i) . Hence we may choose (a_i) as in the first paragraph of the proof. We are thus reduced to the case where A is simple. In that case the assertion is easily verified.

We prove (c). It is enough to note that $a \mapsto \text{tr}(a, E)$ form a basis of the space of R -linear functions $A \rightarrow R$ which vanish on all $aa' - a'a$ and τ is such a function.

We prove (d). We consider the equation in (c) for $a = a_i$ and we multiply both sides by a'_i and sum over i . Using (a), we obtain

$$\sum_i \sum_E g_E \text{tr}(a_i, E) a'_i = \sum_i \tau(a_i) a'_i = 1.$$

Hence $\sum_E g_E \sum_i \text{tr}(a_i, E) a'_i = 1$. By (b), the left hand side acts on a $E' \in \text{Irr} A$ as a scalar $g_{E'} f_{E'}$ times the identity. This proves (d).

(e) follows immediately from (b). The proposition is proved.

19.3. Now let A' be a semisimple subalgebra of A such that τ' , the restriction of τ to A' is a trace form of A' . (We do not assume that the unit element $1_{A'}$ of A' coincides to the unit element 1 of A .) If $E \in \text{Mod} A$ then $1_{A'} E$ is naturally an object of $\text{Mod} A'$. Hence if $E' \in \text{Irr} A'$, then the multiplicity $[E' : 1_{A'} E]$ of E' in $1_{A'} E$ is well defined.

Note that, if $a' \in A'$, then $\text{tr}(a', 1_{A'} E) = \text{tr}(a', E)$.

Lemma 19.4. Let $E' \in \text{Irr} A'$. We have

$$g_{E'} = \sum_E [E' : 1_{A'} E] g_E,$$

sum over all $E \in \text{Irr} A$ (up to isomorphism).

By the definition of $g_{E'}$, it is enough to show that

$$(a) \sum_{E'} \sum_E [E' : 1' E] g_E \text{tr}(a', E') = \tau(a')$$

for any $a' \in A'$. Here E' (resp. E) runs over the isomorphism classes of simple objects of $\text{Mod} A'$ (resp. $\text{Mod} A$). The left hand of (a) is

$$\sum_E g_E \sum_{E'} [E' : 1' E] \text{tr}(a', E') = \sum_E g_E \text{tr}(a', 1' E) = \sum_E g_E \text{tr}(a', E)$$

which, by the definition of g_E is equal to $\tau(a')$. This completes the proof.

20. THE FUNCTION $\mathbf{a}_E$

20.1. In this section we assume that the assumptions of 18.1 hold and that W is finite.

The results of §19 will be applied in the following cases.

(a) $A = \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{C}}, R = \mathbf{C}$. Here $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ takes v to 1. We identify $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{C}}$ with the group algebra $\mathbf{C}[W]$ by $w \mapsto T_w$ for all w . It is well known that $\mathbf{C}[W]$ is a semisimple split algebra. We take τ so that $\tau(x) = \delta_{x,1}$ for $x \in W$. Then the bases (x) and (x^{-1}) are dual with respect to $(,)$.

We will say W -module instead of $\mathbf{C}[W]$ -module. We will write $\text{Mod}W, \text{Irr}W$ instead of $\text{Mod}\mathbf{C}[W], \text{Irr}\mathbf{C}[W]$.

(b) $A = J_{\mathbf{C}}, R = \mathbf{C}$. Since $\mathbf{C}[W]$ is semisimple, we see from 18.12(a) that the kernel of $\phi_{\mathbf{C}} : \mathbf{C}[W] \rightarrow J_{\mathbf{C}}$ is 0 so that $\phi_{\mathbf{C}}$ is injective. Since $\dim \mathbf{C}[W] = \dim J_{\mathbf{C}} = \sharp W$ it follows that $\phi_{\mathbf{C}}$ is an isomorphism. In particular $J_{\mathbf{C}}$ is a semisimple split algebra. We take $\tau : J_{\mathbf{C}} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ so that $\tau(t_z)$ is n_z if $z \in \mathcal{D}$ and 0, otherwise. Then $(t_x, t_y) = \delta_{xy,1}$. The bases (t_x) and $(t_{x^{-1}})$ are dual with respect to $(,)$.

(c) $A = \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{C}(v)}, R = \mathbf{C}(v)$. Here $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ takes v to v . The homomorphism $\phi_{\mathbf{C}(v)} : \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{C}(v)} \rightarrow J_{\mathbf{C}(v)}$ is injective. This follows from 18.12(b), using the fact that injectivity is preserved by tensoring with a field of fractions. Since $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{C}(v)}, J_{\mathbf{C}(v)}$ have the same dimension, it follows that $\phi_{\mathbf{C}(v)}$ is an isomorphism. Since $J_{\mathbf{C}(v)} = \mathbf{C}(v) \otimes J_{\mathbf{C}}$, and $J_{\mathbf{C}}$ is semisimple, split, it follows that $J_{\mathbf{C}(v)}$ is semisimple, split, hence $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{C}(v)}$ is semisimple, split. We take $\tau : \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{C}(v)}$ so that $\tau(T_w) = \delta_{w,1}$. The bases (T_x) and $(T_{x^{-1}})$ are dual with respect to $(,)$.

Remark. The argument above shows also that,

(d) if $R = R_0(v)$, with R_0 an arbitrary field and $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow R$ carries v to v , then $\phi_R : \mathcal{H}_R \rightarrow J_R$ is an isomorphism;

(e) if R in 18.11 is a field of characteristic 0 then $\phi_R : \mathcal{H}_R \rightarrow J_R$ is an isomorphism if and only if $\mathcal{H}_R$ is a semisimple R -algebra.

20.2. For any $E \in \text{Mod}W$ we denote by $E_{\spadesuit}$ the corresponding $J_{\mathbf{C}}$ -module. Thus, $E_{\spadesuit}$ coincides with E as a $\mathbf{C}$ -vector space and the action of $j \in J_{\mathbf{C}}$ on $E_{\spadesuit}$ is the same as the action of $\phi_{\mathbf{C}}^{-1}(j)$ on E . The $J_{\mathbf{C}}$ -module structure on $E_{\spadesuit}$ extends in a natural way to a $J_{\mathbf{C}(v)}$ -module structure on $E_v = \mathbf{C}(v) \otimes_{\mathbf{C}} E_{\spadesuit}$. We will also regard E_v as an $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{C}(v)}$ -module via the algebra isomorphism $\phi_{\mathbf{C}(v)} : \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{C}(v)} \xrightarrow{\sim} J_{\mathbf{C}(v)}$. If E is simple, then $E_{\spadesuit}$ and E_v are simple.

If $E \in \text{Irr}W$. Then $E_{\spadesuit}$ is a simple $J_{\mathbf{C}}$ -module for a unique two-sided cell $\mathbf{c}$ of W . Then for any $x \in \mathbf{c}$, we write $E \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} x$. If $E, E' \in \text{Irr}W$, we write $E \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} E'$ if for some $x \in W$ we have $E \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} x, E' \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} x$.

20.3. There is the following direct relationship between E and E_v (without going through J):

(a) $\text{tr}(x, E) = \text{tr}(T_x, E_v)|_{v=1}$ for all $x \in W$.

Indeed, it is enough to show that $\text{tr}(c_x^\dagger, E) = \text{tr}(c_x^\dagger, E_v)|_{v=1}$. Both sides are equal to $\sum_{z \in W, d \in \mathcal{D}} \gamma_{x,d,z^{-1}} \hat{n}_z \text{tr}(t_z, E_{\spadesuit})$.

20.4. Assume that $E \in \text{Irr}W$. We have

(a) $(f_{E_v})_{v=1} \dim(E) = |W|$.

Indeed, setting $v = 1$ in $\sum_{x \in W} \text{tr}(T_x, E_v) \text{tr}(T_{x^{-1}}, E_v) = f_{E_v} \dim(E)$ gives

$$\sum_{x \in W} \text{tr}(x, E) \text{tr}(x^{-1}, E) = (f_{E_v})_{v=1} \dim(E).$$

The left hand side equals $|W|$; (a) follows.

20.5. Let $I \subset S$, let $E' \in \text{Irr}W_I$ and let $E \in \text{Irr}W$. We have

$$(a) [E'_v : E_v] = [E' : E].$$

The right hand side is $|W_I|^{-1} \sum_{x \in W_I} \text{tr}(x, E') \text{tr}(x^{-1}, E)$. The left hand side is

$$f_{E'_v}^{-1} \dim(E')^{-1} \sum_{x \in W_I} \text{tr}(T_x, E'_v) \text{tr}(T_{x^{-1}}, E_v).$$

Since this is a constant, it is equal to its value for $v = 1$. Hence it is equal to

$$(f_{E'_v}^{-1})_{v=1} \dim(E')^{-1} \sum_{x \in W_I} \text{tr}(x, E'_v) \text{tr}(x^{-1}, E_v).$$

Thus it is enough to show that $(f_{E'_v})_{v=1} \dim(E') = |W_I|$. But this is a special case of 20.4(a).

Proposition 20.6. *Let $E \in \text{Irr}W$.*

(a) *There exists a unique integer $\mathbf{a}_E \geq 0$ such that $\text{tr}(T_x, E_v) \in v^{-\mathbf{a}_E} \mathbf{C}[v]$ for all $x \in W$ and $\text{tr}(T_x, E_v) \notin v^{-\mathbf{a}_E+1} \mathbf{C}[v]$ for some $x \in W$.*

(b) *For $x \in W$ we have $\text{tr}(T_x, E_v) = \text{sgn}(x) v^{-\mathbf{a}_E} \text{tr}(t_x, E_\spadesuit) \pmod{v^{-\mathbf{a}_E+1} \mathbf{C}[v]}$.*

(c) *Let $\mathbf{c}$ be the two-sided cell such that $E_\spadesuit \in \text{Irr}J_{\mathbf{C}}^{\mathbf{c}}$. Then $\mathbf{a}_E = \mathbf{a}(x)$ for any $x \in \mathbf{c}$.*

Let $a = \mathbf{a}(x)$ for any $x \in \mathbf{c}$. By definition,

$$\text{tr}(c_x^\dagger, E_v) = \sum_{z \in W, d \in \mathcal{D}; \mathbf{a}(d) = \mathbf{a}(z)} h_{x,d,z} \hat{n}_z \text{tr}(t_z, E_\spadesuit).$$

In the last sum we have $\text{tr}(t_z, E_\spadesuit) = 0$ unless $z \in \mathbf{c}$ in which case $\mathbf{a}(z) = a$. For such z we have $h_{x,d,z} = \bar{h}_{x,d,z} = \gamma_{x,d,z^{-1}} v^{-a} \pmod{v^{-a+1} \mathbf{Z}[v]}$, hence we have

$$\text{tr}(c_x^\dagger, E_v) = \sum_{z \in W, d \in \mathcal{D}} \gamma_{x,d,z^{-1}} \hat{n}_z v^{-a} \text{tr}(t_z, E_\spadesuit) \pmod{v^{-a+1} \mathbf{C}[v]}.$$

For each z in the last sum we have $\sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} \gamma_{x,d,z^{-1}} \hat{n}_z = \delta_{x,z} n_d \hat{n}_z = \delta_{x,z}$. From this we deduce that

$$(d) \text{tr}(c_x^\dagger, E_v) = v^{-a} \text{tr}(t_x, E_\spadesuit) \pmod{v^{-a+1} \mathbf{C}[v]}.$$

We have $T_x = \sum_{y; y \leq x} q'_{y,x} c_y$. Hence $\text{sgn}(x) \bar{T}_x = T_x^\dagger = \sum_{y; y \leq x} q'_{y,x} c_y^\dagger$. Applying $-$ we obtain $\text{sgn}(x) T_x = \sum_{y; y \leq x} \bar{q}'_{y,x} c_y^\dagger$. Hence

$$\text{tr}(T_x, E_v) = \text{sgn}(x) \sum_{y; y \leq x} \bar{q}'_{y,x} \text{tr}(c_y^\dagger, E_v).$$

Using (d) together with $\bar{q}'_{x,x} = 1$, $\bar{q}'_{y,x} \in v \mathbf{Z}[v]$ (see 10.1), we deduce

$$\text{tr}(T_x, E_v) = \text{sgn}(x) v^{-a} \text{tr}(t_x, E_\spadesuit) \pmod{v^{-a+1} \mathbf{C}[v]}.$$

Since $E_\spadesuit \in \text{Irr}J_{\mathbf{C}}$, we have $\text{tr}(t_x, E_\spadesuit) \neq 0$ for some $x \in W$. The proposition follows.

Corollary 20.7. $f_{E_v} = f_{E_\spadesuit} v^{-2\mathbf{a}_E} + \text{strictly higher powers of } v$.

Using 19.2(e) for $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{C}(v)}$ and $J_{\mathbf{C}}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f_{E_v} \dim E &= \sum_x \text{tr}(T_x, E_v) \text{tr}(T_{x^{-1}}, E_v) \\ &\in v^{-2\mathbf{a}_E} \sum_x \text{tr}(t_x, E_\spadesuit) \text{tr}(t_{x^{-1}}, E_\spadesuit) + v^{-2\mathbf{a}_E+1} \mathbf{C}[v] \\ &= v^{-2\mathbf{a}_E} f_{E_\spadesuit} \dim E + v^{-2\mathbf{a}_E+1} \mathbf{C}[v]. \end{aligned}$$

The corollary follows.

Let $\bar{\cdot} : \mathbf{C}[v, v^{-1}] \rightarrow \mathbf{C}[v, v^{-1}]$ be the $\mathbf{C}$ -algebra homomorphism given by $v^n \mapsto v^{-n}$ for all n .

Corollary 20.8. *For any $x \in W$ we have $\mathrm{Tr}(T_{x^{-1}}, E_v) = \overline{\mathrm{tr}(T_x, E_v)}$.*

We have $T_x = \mathrm{sgn}(x) \sum_{y; y \leq x} \bar{q}'_{y,x} c_y^\dagger$, $T_{x^{-1}} = \mathrm{sgn}(x) \sum_{y; y \leq x} q'_{y,x} c_y^\dagger$, hence

$$\mathrm{tr}(T_x, E_v) = \mathrm{sgn}(x) \sum_{y; y \leq x} \bar{q}'_{y,x} \mathrm{tr}(c_y^\dagger, E_v),$$

$$\mathrm{tr}(T_{x^{-1}}, E_v) = \mathrm{sgn}(x) \sum_{y; y \leq x} q'_{y,x} \mathrm{tr}(c_y^\dagger, E_v).$$

Thus, it suffices to show that $\mathrm{Tr}(c_y^\dagger, E_v) = \overline{\mathrm{tr}(c_y^\dagger, E_v)}$ for any $y \in W$. As in the proof of 20.6 we have

$$\mathrm{tr}(c_y^\dagger, E_v) = \sum_{z \in W, d \in \mathcal{D}; \mathbf{a}(d) = \mathbf{a}(z)} h_{y,d,z} \hat{n}_z \mathrm{tr}(t_z, E_\spadesuit).$$

Hence it suffices to show that $\overline{h_{y,d,z}} = h_{y,d,z}$ for all d, z in the last sum. But this is clearly true for any y, d, z in W .

For any $E \in \mathrm{Mod} W$ we write $E^\dagger$ instead of $E \otimes \mathrm{sgn}$. We write $E_v^\dagger$ instead of $(E^\dagger)_v$.

Lemma 20.9. *Let $E \in \mathrm{Irr} W$. For any $x \in W$ we have*

$$\mathrm{tr}(T_x, (E^\dagger)_v) = (-1)^{l(x)} \overline{\mathrm{tr}(T_x, E_v)}$$

$\dagger : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ (see 3.5) extends uniquely to a $\mathbf{C}(v)$ -algebra involution $\dagger : \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{C}(v)} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{C}(v)}$. Let $(E_v)^\dagger$ be the $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{C}(v)}$ -module with underlying vector space E_v such that the action of h on $E_v^\dagger$ is the same as the action of $h^\dagger$ on E_v . Clearly, $(E_v)^\dagger \in \mathrm{Irr} \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{C}(v)}$. For $x \in W$ we have

$$\mathrm{tr}(T_x, (E_v)^\dagger) = (-1)^{l(x)} \mathrm{tr}(T_{x^{-1}}, E_v) = (-1)^{l(x)} \overline{\mathrm{tr}(T_x, E_v)}.$$

(The last equation follows from 20.8.) Setting $v = 1$ we obtain

$$\mathrm{tr}(T_x, (E_v)^\dagger)|_{v=1} = (-1)^{l(x)} \mathrm{tr}(x, E) = \mathrm{tr}(x, E^\dagger).$$

Using 20.3, we deduce that $(E_v)^\dagger \cong E_v^\dagger$ in $\mathrm{Mod} \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{C}(v)}$. The lemma follows.

Proposition 20.10. *For any $x \in W$ we have*

$$\mathrm{tr}(T_x, E_v) = v^{\mathbf{a}_{E^\dagger}} \mathrm{tr}(t_x, E_\spadesuit^\dagger) + \text{strictly lower powers of } v.$$

Using 20.9 and 20.6 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{tr}(T_x, E_v) &= \mathrm{sgn}(x) \overline{\mathrm{tr}(T_x, E_v^\dagger)} = \overline{v^{-\mathbf{a}_{E^\dagger}} \mathrm{tr}(t_x, E_\spadesuit^\dagger) + \text{strictly higher powers of } v} \\ &= v^{\mathbf{a}_{E^\dagger}} \mathrm{tr}(t_x, E_\spadesuit^\dagger) + \text{strictly lower powers of } v. \end{aligned}$$

The proposition is proved.

Corollary 20.11. $f_{E_v} = f_{E_\spadesuit^\dagger} v^{2\mathbf{a}_{E^\dagger}} + \text{strictly lower powers of } v.$

Using 20.10 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{E_v} \dim E &= \sum_x \operatorname{tr}(T_x, E_v) \operatorname{tr}(T_{x^{-1}}, E_v) \\
&\in v^{2\mathbf{a}_{E^\dagger}} \sum_x \operatorname{tr}(t_x, E_\spadesuit^\dagger) \operatorname{tr}(t_{x^{-1}}, E_\spadesuit^\dagger) + v^{2\mathbf{a}_{E^\dagger}-1} \mathbf{C}[v^{-1}] \\
&= v^{2\mathbf{a}_{E^\dagger}} f_{E_\spadesuit^\dagger} \dim E + v^{2\mathbf{a}_{E^\dagger}-1} \mathbf{C}[v^{-1}].
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 20.12. *Let $E' \in \operatorname{Irr} W_I$. We have $g_{E'_v} = \sum_{E; E \in \operatorname{Irr} W} [E' : E] g_{E_v}$.*

We apply 19.4 with $A = \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{C}(v)}$ and A' the analogous algebra for W_I instead of W , identified naturally with a subspace of A . (In this case the unit elements of the two algebras are compatible hence $1_{A'} E_v = E_v$.) It remains to use 20.5(a).

Lemma 20.13. *Let $E \in \operatorname{Irr} W$.*

- (a) *For any $x \in W$, $\operatorname{tr}(t_{x^{-1}}, E_\spadesuit)$ is the complex conjugate of $\operatorname{tr}(t_x, E_\spadesuit)$.*
- (b) *$f_{E_\spadesuit}$ is a strictly positive real number.*

We prove (a). Let $\langle, \rangle$ be a positive definite hermitian form on E . We define $\langle, \rangle' : E_\spadesuit \times E_\spadesuit \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ by

$$\langle e, e' \rangle' = \sum_{z \in W} \langle t_z e, t_z e' \rangle.$$

This is again a positive definite hermitian form on $E_\spadesuit$. We show that

$$\langle t_x e, e' \rangle' = \langle e, t_{x^{-1}} e' \rangle'$$

for all e, e' . This is equivalent to

$$\sum_{y,z} \gamma_{z,x,y^{-1}} \langle t_y e, t_z e' \rangle = \sum_{y,z} \gamma_{y,x^{-1},z^{-1}} \langle t_y e, t_z e' \rangle$$

which follows from $\gamma_{z,x,y^{-1}} = \gamma_{y,x^{-1},z^{-1}}$. We see that $t_{x^{-1}}$ is the adjoint of t_x with respect to a positive definite hermitian form. (a) follows.

We prove (b). By 19.2(e) we have $f_{E_\spadesuit} \dim(E) = \sum_x \operatorname{tr}(t_x, E_\spadesuit) \operatorname{tr}(t_{x^{-1}}, E_\spadesuit)$. The right hand side of this equality is a real number ≥ 0 , by (a). Hence so is the left hand side. Now $f_{E_\spadesuit} \neq 0$ by 19.2(d) and (b) follows.

Proposition 20.14. *Let $E' \in \operatorname{Irr} W_I$.*

- (a) *For any $E \in \operatorname{Irr} W$ such that $[E' : E] \neq 0$ we have $\mathbf{a}_{E'} \leq \mathbf{a}_E$.*
- (b) *We have $g_{E'_\spadesuit} = \sum [E' : E] g_{E_\spadesuit}$, sum over all $E \in \operatorname{Irr} W$ (up to isomorphism) such that $\mathbf{a}_E = \mathbf{a}_{E'}$.*

Let X be the set of all E (up to isomorphism) such that $[E' : E] \neq 0$ and such that $\mathbf{a}_E$ is minimum, say equal to a . Assume first that $a < \mathbf{a}_{E'}$.

Using 19.2(d) we rewrite 20.12 in the form

$$(c) \quad v^{-2a} f_{E'_v}^{-1} = \sum_{E \in X} [E' : E] v^{-2a} f_{E_v}^{-1}.$$

By 20.7, we have

$$(d) \quad (v^{-2\mathbf{a}_E} f_{E_v}^{-1})|_{v=0} = f_{E_\spadesuit}^{-1}, \quad (v^{-2\mathbf{a}_{E'}} f_{E'_v}^{-1})|_{v=0} = f_{E'_\spadesuit}^{-1},$$

hence by setting $v = 0$ in (c) we obtain

$$0 = \sum_{E \in X} [E' : E] f_{E_\spadesuit}^{-1}.$$

The right hand side is a real number > 0 by 20.8(b). This is a contradiction. Thus we must have $a \geq \mathbf{a}_{E'}$ and (a) is proved.

We now rewrite (c) in the form

$$(e) \ v^{-2\mathbf{a}_{E'}} f_{E'_v}^{-1} = \sum_E [E' : E] v^{-2\mathbf{a}_{E'}} f_{E_v}^{-1}.$$

Using (d) and (a) we see that, setting $v = 0$ in (e) gives

$$f_{E'_\spadesuit}^{-1} = \sum_{E; \mathbf{a}_E = \mathbf{a}_{E'}} [E' : E] f_{E_\spadesuit}^{-1}.$$

This proves (b).

20.15. Let $K(W)$ be the $\mathbf{C}$ -vector space with basis indexed by the $E \in \text{Irr}W$ (up to isomorphism). If $\tilde{E} \in \text{Mod}W$ we identify $\tilde{E}$ with the element $\sum_E [E : \tilde{E}] E \in K(W)$ (E as above).

We define a $\mathbf{C}$ -linear map $\mathbf{j}_{W_I}^W : K(W_I) \rightarrow K(W)$ by

$$\mathbf{j}_{W_I}^W(E') = \sum_E [E' : E] E,$$

sum over all $E \in \text{Irr}W$ (up to isomorphism) such that $\mathbf{a}_E = \mathbf{a}_{E'}$; here $E' \in \text{Irr}W_I$.

We call this *truncated induction*.

Let $I'' \subset I' \subset S$. We show that the following transitivity formula holds:

$$(a) \ \mathbf{j}_{W_{I'}}^W \mathbf{j}_{W_{I''}}^{W_{I'}} = \mathbf{j}_{W_{I''}}^W : K(W_{I''}) \rightarrow K(W).$$

Let $E'' \in \text{Irr}W_{I''}$. We must show that

$$[E'' : E] = \sum_{E'; \mathbf{a}_{E'} = \mathbf{a}_{E''}} [E'' : E'] [E' : E]$$

for any $E'' \in \text{Irr}W_{I''}$, $E \in \text{Irr}W$ such that $\mathbf{a}_{E''} = \mathbf{a}_E$; in the sum we have $E' \in \text{Irr}W_{I'}$. It is clear that

$$[E'' : E] = \sum_{E'} [E'' : E'] [E' : E].$$

Hence it is enough to show that, if $[E'' : E'] [E' : E] \neq 0$, then we have automatically $\mathbf{a}_{E'} = \mathbf{a}_{E''}$. By 2.10(a) we have $\mathbf{a}_{E''} \leq \mathbf{a}_{E'} \leq \mathbf{a}_E$. Since $\mathbf{a}_{E''} = \mathbf{a}_E$, the desired conclusion follows.

20.16. For any $x \in W$ define

$$\gamma_x = \sum_{E; E \in \text{Irr}W} \text{tr}(t_x, E_\spadesuit) E \in K(W).$$

We sometimes write γ_x^W instead of γ_x , to emphasize dependence on W .

Note that γ_x is a $\mathbf{C}$ -linear combination of E such that $E \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} x$. Hence, if E, E' appear with $\neq 0$ coefficient in γ_x then $E \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} E'$.

Proposition 20.17. *If $x \in W_I$, then $\gamma_x^W = \mathbf{j}_{W_I}^W(\gamma_x^{W_I})$.*

An equivalent statement is

$$(a) \ \text{tr}(t_x, E_\spadesuit) = \sum_{E'; \mathbf{a}_E = \mathbf{a}_{E'}} \text{tr}(t_x, E'_\spadesuit) [E' : E]$$

for any $E \in \text{Irr}W$; in the sum we have $E' \in \text{Irr}W_I$. Clearly, we have

$$(b) \ v^{\mathbf{a}_E} \text{tr}(T_x, E_v) = \sum_{E'; E' \in \text{Irr}W_I} v^{\mathbf{a}_{E'}} \text{tr}(T_x, E'_v) [E' : E].$$

In the right hand side we may assume that $\mathbf{a}_{E'} \leq \mathbf{a}_E$. Using this and 20.6, we see that setting $v = 0$ in (b) gives (a). The proposition is proved.

Lemma 20.18. (a) *We have $\mathbf{a}_{\text{sgn}} = L(w_0)$.*

(b) *We have $f_{\text{sgn}_\spadesuit} = 1$.*

(c) *We have $\gamma_{w_0} = \text{sgn}$.*

sgn_v is the one dimensional $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{C}(v)}$ -module on which T_x acts as $\text{sgn}(x)v^{-L(x)}$. (This follows from 20.3.) From 20.6(b) we see that $\mathbf{a}_{\text{sgn}} = L(w_0)$ and that $\text{tr}(t_{w_0}, \text{sgn}_\spadesuit) = 1$. This proves (a).

To prove (c) it remains to show that, if $\text{tr}(t_{w_0}, E_\spadesuit) \neq 0$ (E simple) then $E \cong \text{sgn}$. This assumption shows, by 20.6(c), that $E_\spadesuit \in \text{Irr} J_{\mathbf{C}}^{\mathbf{c}}$ where $\mathbf{c}$ is the two-sided cell such that $\text{sgn}_\spadesuit \in \text{Irr} J_{\mathbf{C}}^{\mathbf{c}}$. Since $\text{tr}(t_{w_0}, \text{sgn}_\spadesuit) = 1$, we have $w_0 \in \mathbf{c}$. From 13.8 it follows that $\{w_0\}$ is a two-sided cell. Thus $\mathbf{c} = \{w_0\}$ and $J_{\mathbf{C}}^{\mathbf{c}}$ is one dimensional. Hence it cannot have more than one simple module. Thus, $E \cong \text{sgn}$. This yields (c) and also (b). The lemma is proved.

20.19. Assume that I, I' form a partition of S such that $W = W_I \times W_{I'}$ (direct product). If $E \in \text{Irr} W_I$ and $E' \in \text{Irr} W_{I'}$, then $E \boxtimes E' \in \text{Irr} W$. From the definitions one checks easily that

$$\mathbf{a}_{E \boxtimes E'} = \mathbf{a}_E + \mathbf{a}_{E'}, f_{(E \boxtimes E')_\spadesuit} = f_{E_\spadesuit} f_{E'_\spadesuit}.$$

Moreover, if $x \in W_I, x' \in W_{I'}$, then

$$\gamma_{xx'}^W = \gamma_x^{W_I} \boxtimes \gamma_{x'}^{W_{I'}}.$$

20.20. In the remainder of this section we assume that w_0 is in the centre of W . Then, for any $E \in \text{Irr} W$, w_0 acts on E as ϵ_E times identity where $\epsilon_E = \pm 1$. Now $E \mapsto \epsilon_E E$ extends to a $\mathbf{C}$ -linear involution $\zeta : K(W) \rightarrow K(W)$.

Lemma 20.21. *Let $E \in \text{Irr} W$. For any $x \in W$ we have*

$$\text{tr}(T_{w_0 x}, E_v) = \epsilon_E v^{-\mathbf{a}_E + \mathbf{a}_{E^\dagger}} \overline{\text{tr}(T_x, E_v)}.$$

Since w_0 is in the centre of W , T_{w_0} is in the centre of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{C}(v)}$ hence it acts on E_v as a scalar $\lambda \in \mathbf{C}(v)$ times the identity. Now $\text{tr}(T_x, E_v) \in \mathbf{C}[v, v^{-1}]$ and $\text{tr}(T_x^{-1}, E_v) \in \mathbf{C}[v, v^{-1}]$. In particular, $\lambda \in \mathbf{C}[v, v^{-1}]$ and $\lambda^{-1} \in \mathbf{C}[v, v^{-1}]$. This implies $\lambda = cv^n$ where $c \in \mathbf{C}$. For $v = 1$, λ becomes ϵ_E . Hence $\lambda = \epsilon_E v^n$ for some n . We have

$$\text{tr}(T_{w_0 x}, E_v) = \text{tr}(T_{w_0} T_{x^{-1}}^{-1}, E_v) = \lambda \text{tr}(T_{x^{-1}}^{-1}, E_v) = \overline{\lambda \text{tr}(T_x, E_v)}.$$

We have

$$\sum_x \text{tr}(T_{w_0 x}, E_v) \text{tr}(T_{x^{-1} w_0}, E_v) = \lambda^2 \sum_x \overline{\text{tr}(T_x, E_v)} \text{tr}(T_{x^{-1}}, E_v)$$

hence $f_{E_v} \dim(E) = \lambda^2 \overline{f_{E_v}} \dim(E)$ so that $f_{E_v} = v^{2n} \overline{f_{E_v}}$. By 20.9, we have

$$\sum_x \overline{\text{tr}(T_x, E_v)} \text{tr}(T_{x^{-1}}, E_v) = \sum_x \text{tr}(T_x, E_v^\dagger) \text{tr}(T_{x^{-1}}, E_v^\dagger)$$

hence $\overline{f_{E_v}} = f_{E_v^\dagger}$. We see that $f_{E_v} = v^{2n} f_{(E^\dagger)_v}$. Comparing the lowest terms we see that

$$-2\mathbf{a}_E = 2n - 2\mathbf{a}_{E^\dagger} \text{ hence } n = -\mathbf{a}_E + \mathbf{a}_{E^\dagger}$$

and that

$$(a) \ f_{E_\spadesuit} = f_{E^\dagger_\spadesuit}.$$

Lemma 20.22. $v^{\mathbf{a}_E} \text{tr}(T_{w_0 x}, E_v) = \epsilon_E (-1)^{l(x)} v^{\mathbf{a}_{E^\dagger}} \text{tr}(T_x, E_v^\dagger).$

We combine 20.8, 20.21.

Lemma 20.23. *For any $x \in W$ we have $\gamma_{xw_0} = \text{sgn}(x) \zeta(\gamma_x) \otimes \text{sgn}$.*

An equivalent statement is

$$\text{tr}(t_{xw_0}, E_\spadesuit) = \text{sgn}(x) \text{tr}(t_x, E_\spadesuit^\dagger) \epsilon_{E^\dagger}$$

for any $E \in \text{Irr} W$. Setting $v = 0$ in the identity in 20.22 gives

$$\text{sgn}(xw_0)\text{tr}(t_{w_0x}, E_\spadesuit) = \epsilon_E \text{tr}(t_x, E_\spadesuit^\dagger).$$

It remains to show that $\epsilon_{E^\dagger} = \epsilon_E \text{sgn}(w_0)$. This is clear.

20.24. By the Cayley-Hamilton theorem, any element $r \in J$ satisfies an equation of the form $r^n + a_1 r^{n-1} + \cdots + a_n = 0$ where $a_i \in \mathbf{Z}$. (We use that the structure constants of J are integers.) This holds in particular for $r = t_x$ where $x \in W$. Hence for any $\mathcal{E} \in \text{Irr} J_{\mathbf{C}}$, $\text{tr}(t_x, \mathcal{E})$ is an algebraic integer. If R is a subfield of $\mathbf{C}$ such that the group algebra $R[W]$ is split over R , then J_R is split over R and it follows that for $x, \mathcal{E}$ as above, $\text{tr}(t_x, \mathcal{E})$ is an algebraic integer in R . In particular, if we can take $R = \mathbf{Q}$, then $\text{tr}(t_x, \mathcal{E}) \in \mathbf{Z}$.

21. STUDY OF A LEFT CELL

21.1. In this section we preserve the setup of 20.1. Let Γ be a left cell of W, L . Let d be the unique element in $\Gamma \cap \mathcal{D}$. The $\mathcal{A}$ -submodule $\sum_{y \in \Gamma} \mathcal{A}c_y^\dagger$ of $\mathcal{H}$ can be regarded as an $\mathcal{H}$ -module by the rule $c_x^\dagger \cdot c_w^\dagger = \sum_{z \in \Gamma} h_{x,y,z} c_z^\dagger$ with $x \in W, y \in W$. By change of scalars ($v \mapsto 1$) this gives rise to an $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C}[W]$ -module $[\Gamma]$. On the other hand, $J_{\mathbf{C}}^\Gamma = \oplus_{y \in \Gamma} \mathbf{C}t_y$ is a left ideal in $J_{\mathbf{C}}$ by 14.2(P8).

Lemma 21.2. *The $\mathbf{C}$ -linear isomorphism $t_y \mapsto \hat{n}_y c_y^\dagger$ for $y \in \Gamma$ is an isomorphism of $J_{\mathbf{C}}$ -modules $J_{\mathbf{C}}^\Gamma \xrightarrow{\sim} [\Gamma]_\spadesuit$.*

We have $\Gamma \subset X_a = \{w \in W \mid \mathbf{a}(x) = a\}$ for some $a \in \mathbf{N}$. The $\mathcal{A}$ -submodule $\sum_{y \in X_a} \mathcal{A}c_y^\dagger$ of $\mathcal{H}$ can be regarded as an $\mathcal{H}$ -module by the rule

$$c_x^\dagger \cdot c_w^\dagger = \sum_{z \in X_a} h_{x,y,z} c_z^\dagger$$

with $x \in W, y \in W$. By change of scalars ($v \mapsto 1$) this gives rise to an $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C}[W]$ -module $[X_a]$. On the other hand, $J_{\mathbf{C}}^{X_a} = \oplus_{y \in X_a} \mathbf{C}t_y$ is a left (even two-sided) ideal in $J_{\mathbf{C}}$. The $\mathbf{C}$ -linear map in the lemma extends by the same formula to a $\mathbf{C}$ -linear isomorphism $J_{\mathbf{C}}^{X_a} \xrightarrow{\sim} [X_a]_\spadesuit$. It is enough to show that this is $J_{\mathbf{C}}$ -linear. This follows from the computation in 18.10. The lemma is proved.

Lemma 21.3. *Let $\mathcal{E} \in \text{Irr} J_{\mathbf{C}}$. The $\mathbf{C}$ -linear map $u : \text{Hom}_{J_{\mathbf{C}}}(J_{\mathbf{C}}^\Gamma, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow t_d \mathcal{E}$ given by $\xi \mapsto \xi(n_d t_d)$ is an isomorphism.*

u is well defined since $\xi(n_d t_d) = t_d \xi(t_d) \in t_d \mathcal{E}$. We define a linear map in the opposite direction by $e \mapsto [j \mapsto j e]$. It is clear that this is the inverse of u . (We use that $j n_d t_d = j$ for $j \in J_{\mathbf{C}}^\Gamma$.) The lemma is proved.

Proposition 21.4. *We have $\gamma_d = n_d \sum_E [E : [\Gamma]] E$ (sum over all $E \in \text{Irr} W$ up to isomorphism).*

An equivalent statement is that $\text{tr}(n_d t_d, E_\spadesuit) = [E : [\Gamma]]$, for E as above. By 21.2, we have $[E : [\Gamma]] = [E_\spadesuit : J_{\mathbf{C}}^\Gamma]$. Hence it remains to show that $\text{tr}(n_d t_d, \mathcal{E}) = [\mathcal{E} : J_{\mathbf{C}}^\Gamma]$ for any $\mathcal{E} \in \text{Irr} J_{\mathbf{C}}$. Since $\mathcal{E} = \oplus_{d' \in \mathcal{D}} n_{d'} t_{d'} \mathcal{E}$ and $n_d t_d : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ is the projection to the summand $n_d t_d \mathcal{E}$, we see that $\text{tr}(n_d t_d, \mathcal{E}) = \dim(t_d \mathcal{E})$. It remains to show that $\dim(t_d \mathcal{E}) = [\mathcal{E} : J_{\mathbf{C}}^\Gamma]$. This follows from 21.3.

Proposition 21.5. $[\Gamma]^\dagger, [\Gamma w_0]$ are isomorphic in $\text{Mod} W$.

We may identify $[\Gamma]^\dagger$ with the W -module with $\mathbf{C}$ -basis $e_y (y \in \Gamma)$ where $s \in S$ acts by $e_y \mapsto -e_y + \sum_{z \in \Gamma} h_{s,y,z} e_z$.

On the other hand we may identify $[\Gamma w_0]$ with the W -module with $\mathbf{C}$ -basis $e'_{yw_0} (y \in \Gamma)$ where $s \in S$ acts by $e'_{yw_0} \mapsto e'_{yw_0} - \sum_{z \in \Gamma} h_{s,yw_0,zw_0} e'_{zw_0}$.

The W -module dual to $[\Gamma]^\dagger$ has a $\mathbf{C}$ -basis $e''_y (y \in \Gamma)$ (dual to (e_y)) in which the action of $s \in S$ is given by $e''_y \mapsto -e''_y + \sum_{z \in \Gamma} h_{s,z,y} e''_z$. We define a $\mathbf{C}$ -isomorphism between this last space and $[\Gamma w_0]$ by $e''_y \mapsto \text{sgn}(y) e'_{yw_0}$ for all y . We show that this commutes with the action of W . It suffices to show that for any $s \in S$, we have

- (a) $-h_{s,z,y} = \text{sgn}(y) \text{sgn}(z) h_{s,yw_0,zw_0}$ for all $z \neq y$ and
- (b) $1 - h_{s,y,y} = -1 + h_{s,yw_0,yw_0}$ for all y .

We use 6.6. Assume first that $sz > z$. If $sy > y$ and $y \neq z$, both sides of (a) are 0. If $sy < y < z$ then (a) follows from 11.6. If $y = sz$ then both sides of (a) are -1 . If $sy < y$ but $y \not\leq z$ or $y \neq sz$ then both sides of (a) are 0.

Assume next that $sz < z$. If $z \neq y$ then both sides of (a) are 0.

If $sy > y$, both sides of (b) are 1. If $sy < y$, both sides of (b) are -1 . Thus (a),(b) are verified. Since $[\Gamma]^\dagger$ and its dual are isomorphic in $\text{Mod} W$ (they are defined over $\mathbf{Q}$), the lemma follows.

Corollary 21.6. Let $E \in \text{Irr} W$ and let $\mathbf{c}$ be the two-sided cell of W such that $E_\spadesuit \in \text{Irr} J_\mathbf{C}^\mathbf{c}$. Then $E_\spadesuit^\dagger \in \text{Irr} J_\mathbf{C}^{cw_0}$.

Replacing Γ by $\mathbf{c}$ in the definition of $[\Gamma]$ we obtain a W -module $[\mathbf{c}]$. Then 21.2, 21.5 hold with Γ replaced by $\mathbf{c}$ with the same proof. Our assumption implies (by 21.2 for $\mathbf{c}$) that E appears in the W -module $[\mathbf{c}]$. Using 21.5 for $\mathbf{c}$ we deduce that $E^\dagger$ appears in the W -module $[\mathbf{c}w_0]$. Using 21.2 for $\mathbf{c}w_0$, we deduce that $E_\spadesuit^\dagger$ appears in the $J_\mathbf{C}$ -module $J_\mathbf{C}^{cw_0}$. The corollary follows.

Corollary 21.7. Let $E, E' \in \text{Irr} W$ be such that $E \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} E'$. Then $E^\dagger \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} E'^\dagger$.

By assumption there exists a two-sided cell $\mathbf{c}$ such that $E_\spadesuit, E'_\spadesuit \in \text{Irr} J_\mathbf{C}^\mathbf{c}$. By 21.6, $E_\spadesuit^\dagger, E'^\dagger_\spadesuit \in \text{Irr} J_\mathbf{C}^{cw_0}$. The corollary follows.

21.8. The results of §19 are applicable to A , the $\mathbf{C}$ -subspace $J_\mathbf{C}^{\Gamma \cap \Gamma^{-1}}$ of $J_\mathbf{C}$ spanned by $\Gamma \cap \Gamma^{-1}$ and $R = \mathbf{C}$. This is a $\mathbf{C}$ -subalgebra of $J_\mathbf{C}$ with unit element t_d . In 21.9 we will show that $J_\mathbf{C}^{\Gamma \cap \Gamma^{-1}}$ is semisimple. It is then clearly split. We take $\tau : J_\mathbf{C}^{\Gamma \cap \Gamma^{-1}} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ so that $\tau(t_x) = \delta_{x,d}$. (This is the restriction of $\tau : J_\mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$.) We have $(t_x, t_y) = \delta_{xy,1}$. The bases (t_x) and $(t_{x^{-1}})$ (where x runs through $\Gamma \cap \Gamma^{-1}$) are dual with respect to $(,)$.

21.9. We show that the $\mathbf{C}$ -algebra $J_\mathbf{C}^{\Gamma \cap \Gamma^{-1}}$ is semisimple. It is enough to prove the analogous statement for the $\mathbf{Q}$ -algebra A' , the $\mathbf{Q}$ -span of $\Gamma \cap \Gamma^{-1}$ in $J_\mathbf{Q}$. We define a $\mathbf{Q}$ -bilinear pairing $(|) : A' \times A' \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}$ by $(t_x | t_y) = \delta_{x,y}$ for $x, y \in \Gamma \cap \Gamma^{-1}$. Let $j \mapsto \tilde{j}$ be the $\mathbf{Q}$ -linear map $A' \rightarrow A'$ given by $\tilde{t}_x = t_{x^{-1}}$ for all x . We show that

$$(a) (j_1 j_2 | j_3) = (j_2 | \tilde{j}_1 j_3)$$

for all j_1, j_2, j_3 in our ring. We may assume that $j_1 = t_x, j_2 = t_y, j_3 = t_z$. Then (a) follows from

$$\gamma_{x,y,z^{-1}} = \gamma_{x^{-1},z,y^{-1}}.$$

Now let I be a left ideal of A' . Let $I^\perp = \{a \in A' \mid (a|I) = 0\}$. Since $(|)$ is positive definite, we have $A' = I \oplus I^\perp$. From (c) we see that $I^\perp$ is a left ideal. This proves that A' is semisimple.

The same proof could be used to show directly that $J_{\mathbf{C}}$ is semisimple.

Proposition 21.10. *Let $E, E' \in \text{Irr} W$. Let $N = \sum_{x \in \Gamma \cap \Gamma^{-1}} \text{tr}(t_x, E_\spadesuit) \text{tr}(t_{x^{-1}}, E'_\spadesuit)$. Then $N = f_{E_\spadesuit}[E : [\Gamma]]$ if E, E' are isomorphic and $N = 0$, otherwise.* ■

If $\mathcal{E} \in \text{Irr} J_{\mathbf{C}}$, then $t_d \mathcal{E}$ is either 0 or in $\text{Irr} J_{\mathbf{C}}^{\Gamma \cap \Gamma^{-1}}$. Moreover, $\mathcal{E} \mapsto t_d \mathcal{E}$ defines a bijection between the set of simple $J_{\mathbf{C}}$ -modules (up to isomorphism) which appear in the $J_{\mathbf{C}}$ -module $J_{\mathbf{C}}^\Gamma$ and the set of simple $J_{\mathbf{C}}^{\Gamma \cap \Gamma^{-1}}$ -modules (up to isomorphism). We then have $\dim(t_d \mathcal{E}) = [\mathcal{E} : J_{\mathbf{C}}^\Gamma]$. Note that, for $j \in J_{\mathbf{C}}^{\Gamma \cap \Gamma^{-1}}$ we have $\text{tr}(j, \mathcal{E}) = \text{tr}(j, t_d \mathcal{E})$. If $t_d E_\spadesuit = 0$ or $t_d E'_\spadesuit = 0$, then $N = 0$ and the result is clear. If $t_d E_\spadesuit \neq 0$ and $t_d E'_\spadesuit \neq 0$ then, by 19.2(e), we see that $N = f_{t_d E_\spadesuit}[E_\spadesuit : J_{\mathbf{C}}^\Gamma]$ if E, E' are isomorphic and to 0, otherwise. It remains to show that $f_{t_d E_\spadesuit} = f_{E_\spadesuit}$, $[E : [\Gamma]] = [E_\spadesuit : J_{\mathbf{C}}^\Gamma]$ and the analogous equalities for E' . Now $f_{t_d E_\spadesuit} = f_{E_\spadesuit}$ follows from 19.4 applied to $(A', A) = (J_{\mathbf{C}}^{\Gamma \cap \Gamma^{-1}}, J_{\mathbf{C}})$; the equality $[E : [\Gamma]] = [E_\spadesuit : J_{\mathbf{C}}^\Gamma]$ follows from 21.2. The proposition is proved.

22. CONSTRUCTIBLE REPRESENTATIONS

22.1. In this section we preserve the setup of 20.1.

We define a class $\text{Con}(W)$ of W -modules (relative to our fixed $L : W \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$) by induction on $|S|$. If $|S| = 0$ so that $W = \{1\}$, $\text{Con}(W)$ consists of the unit representation. Assume now that $|S| > 0$. Then $\text{Con}(W)$ consists of the W -modules of the form $\mathbf{j}_{W_I}^W(E')$ or $\mathbf{j}_{W_I}^W(E') \otimes \text{sgn}$ for various subsets $I \subset S, I \neq S$ and various $E' \in \text{Con}(W_I)$. (If we restrict ourselves to I such that $|I| = |S| - 1$ we get the same class of W -modules, by the transitivity of truncated induction.) The W -modules in $\text{Con}(W)$ are said to be the *constructible representations* of W .

Note that the unit representation of W is constructible (it is obtained by truncated induction from the unit representation of the subgroup with one element). Hence $\text{sgn} \in \text{Con}(W)$.

Lemma 22.2. *If $E \in \text{Con}(W)$, then there exists a left cell Γ of W such that $E = [\Gamma]$.*

We argue by induction on $|S|$. If $|S| = 0$ the result is obvious. Assume now that $|S| > 0$. Let $E \in \text{Con}(W)$.

Case 1. $E = \mathbf{j}_{W_I}^W(E')$ where $I \subset S, I \neq S$ and $E' \in \text{Con}(W_I)$. By the induction hypothesis there exists a left cell Γ' of W_I such that $E' = [\Gamma']$. Let $d \in \Gamma' \cap \mathcal{D}$. By 21.4 we have $\gamma_d^{W_I} = [\Gamma'] = E'$. By 20.17 we have $E = \mathbf{j}_{W_I}^W(E') = \mathbf{j}_{W_I}^W(\gamma_d^{W_I}) = \gamma_d^W$.

Let Γ be the left cell of W that contains d . By 21.4 we have $\gamma_d^W = [\Gamma]$. Hence $E = [\Gamma]$.

Case 2. $E = \mathbf{j}_{W_I}^W(E') \otimes \text{sgn}$ where $I \subset S, I \neq S$ and $E' \in \text{Con}(W_I)$. Then by Case 1, $E \otimes \text{sgn} = [\Gamma]$ for some left cell Γ of W . By 21.5 we have $E = [\Gamma w_0]$. The lemma is proved.

Proposition 22.3. *For any $E \in \text{Irr}W$ there exists a constructible representation of W which contains a simple component isomorphic to E .*

The general case can be easily reduced to the case where W is irreducible. Assume now that W is irreducible. If $L = al$ for some $a > 0$, the constructible representations of W are listed in [...] and the proposition is easily checked. (See also the discussion of types A, D in 22.5, 22.26.) In the cases where W is irreducible but L is not of the form al , the constructible representations are described later in this section and this yields the proposition in all cases.

22.4. Let $W = \mathfrak{S}_n$ be the group of permutations of $1, 2, \dots, n$. We regard W as a Coxeter group with generators

$s_1 = (1, 2), s_2 = (2, 3), \dots, s_{n-1} = (n-1, n)$,
(transpositions). We take $L = al$ where $a > 0$.

The simple W -modules (up to isomorphism) are in 1-1 correspondence with the partitions $\alpha = (\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_2 \geq \dots)$ such that $\alpha_N = 0$ for large N and $\sum_i \alpha_i = n$. The correspondence (denoted by $\alpha \mapsto \pi_\alpha$) is defined as follows. Let α be as above, let $(\alpha'_1 \geq \alpha'_2 \geq \dots)$ be the partition dual to α . Let π_α be the simple W -module whose restriction to $\mathfrak{S}_{\alpha_1} \times \mathfrak{S}_{\alpha_2} \dots$ contains 1 and whose restriction to $\mathfrak{S}_{\alpha'_1} \times \mathfrak{S}_{\alpha'_2} \dots$ contains the sign representation. We have (a consequence of results of Steinberg):

$$f_{(\pi_\alpha)_v} = v^{-\sum_i 2 \binom{\alpha'_i}{2}} + \text{strictly higher powers of } v.$$

It follows that

$$(a) \mathbf{a}_{\pi_\alpha} = \sum_i a \binom{\alpha'_i}{2} \text{ and } f_{(\pi_\alpha)_\spadesuit} = 1.$$

Lemma 22.5. *In the setup of 22.4, a W -module is constructible if and only if it is simple.*

For any sequence $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots)$ in $\mathbf{N}$ such that $\beta_N = 0$ for large N and $\sum_i \beta_i = n$, we set

$$I_\beta = \{s_i | i \in [1, n-1], i \neq \beta_1, i \neq \beta_1 + \beta_2, \dots\}.$$

From 22.4(a) we see easily that, if β is the same as α' up to order, then

$$(a) \mathbf{j}_{W_{I_\beta}}^W(\text{sgn}) = \pi_\alpha.$$

Since the $\text{sgn} \in \text{Con}(W_{I_\beta})$, it follows that $\pi_\alpha \in \text{Con}(W)$. Thus any simple W -module is constructible.

We now show that any constructible representation E of $W = \mathfrak{S}_n$ is simple. We may assume that $n \geq 1$ and that the analogous result is true for any $W_{I'} \neq W$. We may assume that $E = \mathbf{j}_{W_{I_\beta}}^W(C)$ where β is as above, $W_{I_\beta} \neq W$ and $C \in \text{Con}(W_{I_\beta})$.

By the induction hypothesis, C is simple. Since the analogue of (a) holds for W_{I_β} (instead of W) we have $C = \mathbf{j}_{W_{I_{\beta'}}}^{W_{I_\beta}}(\text{sgn})$ for some β' such that $W_{I_{\beta'}} \subset W_{I_\beta}$. By the transitivity of truncated induction we have $E = \mathbf{j}_{W_{I_{\beta'}}}^W(\text{sgn})$. Hence, by (a), for β' instead of β , E is simple. The lemma is proved.

22.6. We now develop some combinatorics which is useful for the verification of 22.3 for W of classical type.

Let $a > 0, b \geq 0$ be integers. We can write uniquely $b = ar + b'$ where $r, b' \in \mathbf{N}$ and $b' < a$. Let $N \in \mathbf{N}$. Let $\mathcal{M}_{a,b}^N$ be the set of multisets $\tilde{Z} = \{\tilde{z}_1 \leq \tilde{z}_2 \leq \dots \leq \tilde{z}_{2N+r}\}$ of integers ≥ 0 such that

(a) if $b' = 0$, there are at least $N + r$ distinct entries in $\tilde{Z}$, no entry is repeated more than twice and all entries of $\tilde{Z}$ are divisible by a ;

(b) if $b' > 0$, all inequalities in $\tilde{Z}$ are strict and N entries of $\tilde{Z}$ are divisible by a and $N + r$ entries of $\tilde{Z}$ are equal to b' modulo a .

The entries which appear in $\tilde{Z}$ exactly once are called the *singles* of $\tilde{Z}$; they form a set Z . The other entries of $\tilde{Z}$ are called the *doubles* of $\tilde{Z}$.

For example, the multiset $\tilde{Z}^0$ whose entries are (up to order)

$$0, a, 2a, \dots, (N-1)a, b', a + b', 2a + b', \dots, (N+r-1)a + b'$$

belongs to $\mathcal{M}_{a,b}^N$. Clearly, the sum of entries of $\tilde{Z}$ minus the sum of entries of $\tilde{Z}^0$ is ≥ 0 and divisible by a , hence it is equal to an for a well defined $n \in \mathbf{N}$ said to be the *rank* of $\tilde{Z}$. We have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{2N+r} \tilde{z}_k = an + aN^2 + N(b-a) + a\binom{r}{2} + b'r.$$

Note that $\tilde{Z}^0$ has rank 0. Let $\mathcal{M}_{a,b;n}^N$ be the set of multisets of rank n in $\mathcal{M}_{a,b}^N$. We define an (injective) map $\mathcal{M}_{a,b}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{a,b}^{N+1}$ by

$$\{\tilde{z}_1 \leq \tilde{z}_2 \leq \dots \tilde{z}_{2N+r}\} \mapsto \{0, b', \tilde{z}_1 + a \leq \tilde{z}_2 + a \leq \dots \tilde{z}_{2N+r} + a\}.$$

This restricts for any $n \in \mathbf{N}$ to an (injective) map

$$(c) \mathcal{M}_{a,b;n}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{a,b;n}^{N+1}.$$

It is easy to see that, for fixed n , $|\mathcal{M}_{a,b;n}^N|$ is bounded as $N \rightarrow \infty$, hence the maps (c) are bijections for large N . Let $\mathcal{M}_{a,b;n}$ be the inductive limit of $\mathcal{M}_{a,b;n}^N$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ (with respect to the maps (c)).

22.7. Let $\text{Sy}_{a,b;n}^N$ be the set consisting of all tableaux (or *symbols*)

$$\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{N+r}$$

$$(a) \quad \mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_N$$

where $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots < \lambda_{N+r}$ are integers ≥ 0 , congruent to b' modulo a , $\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_N$ are integers ≥ 0 , divisible by a and

$$\sum_i \lambda_i + \sum_j \mu_j = an + aN^2 + N(b-a) + a\binom{r}{2} + b'r.$$

If we arrange the entries of Λ in a single row, we obtain a multiset $\tilde{Z} \in \mathcal{M}_{a,b;n}^N$. This defines a (surjective) map $\pi_N : \text{Sy}_{a,b;n}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{a,b;n}^N$.

We define an (injective) map

$$(b) \text{Sy}_{a,b;n}^N \rightarrow \text{Sy}_{a,b;n}^{N+1}$$

by associating to (a) the symbol

$$\begin{aligned} & b', \lambda_1 + a, \lambda_2 + a, \dots, \lambda_{N+r} + a \\ & 0, \mu_1 + a, \mu_2 + a, \dots, \mu_N + a. \end{aligned}$$

This is compatible with the map $\mathcal{M}_{a,b}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{a,b}^{N+1}$ in 22.6 (via π_N, π_{N+1}).

Since for fixed n , $|\text{Sy}_{a,b;n}^N|$ is bounded as $N \rightarrow \infty$, the maps (b) are bijections for large N . Let $\text{Sy}_{a,b;n}$ be the inductive limit of $\text{Sy}_{a,b;n}^N$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ (with respect to the maps (b)).

22.8. Let $\tilde{Z} = \{\tilde{z}_1 \leq \tilde{z}_2 \leq \dots \leq \tilde{z}_{2N+r}\} \in \mathcal{M}_{a,b;n}^N$. Let t be an integer which is large enough so that the multiset

$$(a) \{at + b' - \tilde{z}_1, at + b' - \tilde{z}_2, \dots, at + b' - \tilde{z}_{2N+r}\}$$

is contained in the multiset

$$(b) \{0, a, 2a, \dots, ta, b', a + b', 2a + b', \dots, ta + b'\}$$

and let $\tilde{\tilde{Z}}$ be the complement of (a) in (b). Then $\tilde{\tilde{Z}} \in \mathcal{M}_{a,b}^{t+1-N-r}$. The sum of entries of $\tilde{\tilde{Z}}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \in [0,t]} (2ka + b') - (at + b')(2N + r) + \sum_h \tilde{z}_h \\ &= at(t+1) + (t+1)b' - (at + b')(2N + r) + an + aN^2 + N(b-a) + a \binom{r}{2} + b'r \\ &= an + a(t+1-N-r)^2 + (t+1-N-r)(b-a) + a \binom{r}{2} + b'r. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\tilde{\tilde{Z}}$ has rank n .

We define a bijection $\pi_N^{-1}(\tilde{Z}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \pi_{t+1-N-r}^{-1}(\tilde{\tilde{Z}})$ by $\Lambda \mapsto \bar{\Lambda}$ where Λ is as in 22.7(a) and $\bar{\Lambda}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} & \{b', a + b', 2a + b', 3a + b', \dots, ta + b'\} - \{at + b' - \mu_1, at + b' - \mu_2, \dots, at + b' - \mu_N\} \\ & \{0, a, 2a, 3a, \dots, ta\} - \{at + b' - \lambda_1, at + b' - \lambda_2, \dots, at + b' - \lambda_{N+r}\}. \end{aligned} \quad \blacksquare$$

22.9. Let $W = W_n$ be the group of permutations of $1, 2, \dots, n, n', \dots, 2', 1'$ which commute with the involution $i \mapsto i', i' \mapsto i$. We regard W_n as a Coxeter group with generators $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n$ given as products of transpositions by

$$\begin{aligned} & s_1 = (1, 2)(1', 2'), s_2 = (2, 3)(2', 3'), \dots, s_{n-1} = (n-1, n)((n-1)', n'), \\ & s_n = (n, n'). \end{aligned}$$

22.10. A permutation in W defines a permutation of the n element set consisting of the pairs $(1, 1'), (2, 2'), \dots, (n, n')$. Thus we have a natural homomorphism of W_n onto $\mathfrak{S}_n$, the symmetric group in n letters. Let $\chi_n : W_n \rightarrow \pm 1$ be the homomorphism defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_n(\sigma) &= 1 \text{ if } \{\sigma(1), \sigma(2), \dots, \sigma(n)\} \cap \{1', 2', \dots, n'\} \text{ has even cardinality,} \\ \chi_n(\sigma) &= -1, \text{ otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

The simple W -modules (up to isomorphism) are in 1-1 correspondence with the ordered pairs α, β where $\alpha = (\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_2 \geq \dots)$ and $\beta = (\beta_1 \geq \beta_2 \geq \dots)$ are partitions such that $\alpha_N = \mathbf{E}_N = 0$ for large N and $\sum_i \alpha_i + \sum_j \beta_j = n$. The correspondence (denoted by $\alpha, \beta \mapsto E^{\alpha, \beta}$) is defined as follows. Let α, β be as above, let $(\alpha'_1 \geq \alpha'_2 \geq \dots)$ be the partition dual to α and let $(\beta'_1 \geq \beta'_2 \geq \dots)$ be the partition dual to β . Let $k = \sum_i \alpha_i, l = \sum_j \beta_j$. Let π_α be the simple $\mathfrak{S}_k$ -module defined as in 22.4 and let π_β be the analogously defined simple $\mathfrak{S}_l$ -module. We regard π_α, π_β as simple modules of W_k, W_l via the natural homomorphisms $W_k \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}_k, W_l \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}_l$ as above. We identify $W_k \times W_l$ with the subgroup of W consisting of all permutations in W which map $1, 2, \dots, k, k', \dots, 2', 1'$ into itself hence also map $k+1, k+2, \dots, n, n', \dots, (k+2)', (k+1)'$ into itself. Consider the representation $\pi_\alpha \otimes (\pi_\beta \otimes \chi_l)$ of $W_k \times W_l$. We induce it to W ; the resulting representation of W is irreducible; we denote it by $E^{\alpha, \beta}$.

We fix $a > 0, b \geq 0$ and we write $b = ar + b'$ as in 22.6.

Let α, β be as in 22.10. Let N be an integer such that $\alpha_{N+r+1} = 0, \beta_{N+1} = 0$. (Any large enough integer satisfies these conditions.) We set

$$\lambda_i = a(\alpha_{N+r-i+1} + i - 1) + b', (i \in [1, N+r]), \quad \mu_j = a(\beta_{N-j+1} + j - 1), (j \in [1, N]).$$

We have $0 \leq \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots < \lambda_{N+r}, 0 \leq \mu_1 < \mu_2 < \dots < \mu_N$. Let Λ denote the tableau 22.7(a). It is easy to see that $\Lambda \in \text{Sy}_{a,b;n}^N$. Moreover, if N is replaced by $N+1$, then Λ is replaced by its image under $\text{Sy}_{a,b;n}^N \rightarrow \text{Sy}_{a,b;n}^{N+1}$ (see 22.7). Let $[\Lambda] = E^{\alpha, \beta}$. Note that $[\Lambda]$ depends only on the image of Λ under the canonical map $\text{Sy}_{a,b;n}^N \rightarrow \text{Sy}_{a,b;n}$. In this way, we see that

the simple W -modules are naturally in bijection with the set $\text{Sy}_{a,b;n}$.

For $i \in [1, N]$ we have $a(\alpha_{N-i+1} + i - 1) + b = a(\alpha_{N+r-i-r+1} + i + r - 1) + b' = \lambda_{i+r}$.

If N is large we have $\lambda_i = a(i - 1) + b'$ for $i \in [1, r]$ and $\mu_j = a(j - 1)$ for $j \in [1, r]$.

22.11. Let q, y be indeterminates. With the notation in 22.15, let

$$H_\alpha(q) = q^{-\sum_i \binom{\alpha'_i}{2}} \prod_{i,j} \frac{q^{\alpha_i + \alpha'_j - i - j + 1} - 1}{q - 1},$$

$$G_{\alpha, \beta}(q, y) = q^{-\sum_i \alpha'_i \beta'_i / 2} \prod_{i,j} (q^{\alpha_i + \beta'_j - i - j + 1} y + 1);$$

both products are taken over all $i \geq 1, j \geq 1$ such that $\alpha_i \geq j, \alpha'_j \geq i$.

Let $L : W \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ be the weight function defined by $L(s_1) = L(s_2) = \dots = L(s_{n-1}) = a$, $L(s_n) = b$. We now assume that both a, b are > 0 . We also assume that a, b are such that W, L satisfies the assumptions of 18.1. Then $f_{E_v^{\alpha, \beta}}$ is defined in terms of this L .

Lemma 22.12 (Hoefsmit [Ho]). *We have*

$$f_{E_v^{\alpha, \beta}} = H_\alpha(v^{2a})H_\beta(v^{2a})G_{\alpha, \beta}(v^{2a}, v^{2b})G_{\beta, \alpha}(v^{2a}, v^{-2b}).$$

We will rewrite the expression above using the following result.

Lemma 22.13. *Let N be a large integer. We have*

$$H_\alpha(q) = q^{\sum_{i \in [1, N-1]} \binom{i}{2}} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^N \prod_{h \in [1, \alpha_{N-i+1}+i-1]} \frac{q^h - 1}{q - 1}}{\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \frac{q^{\alpha_{N-j+1}+j-1} - q^{\alpha_{N-i+1}+i-1}}{q - 1}},$$

$$G_{\alpha, \beta}(q, y)G_{\beta, \alpha}(q, y^{-1}) = q^{\sum_{i \in [1, N-1]} i^2} (\sqrt{y} + \sqrt{y}^{-1})^N \\ \times \frac{\prod_{i=1}^N \prod_{h \in [1, \alpha_{N-i+1}+i-1]} (q^h y + 1) \prod_{j=1}^N \prod_{h \in [1, \beta_{N-j+1}+j-1]} (q^h y^{-1} + 1)}{\prod_{i, j \in [1, N]} (q^{\alpha_{N-i+1}+i-1} \sqrt{y} + q^{\beta_{N-j+1}+j-1} \sqrt{y}^{-1})}.$$

The proof is by induction on n . We omit it.

Proposition 22.14. (a) *If $b' = 0$ then $f_{[\Lambda]_\spadesuit}$ is equal to 2^d where $2d + r$ is the number of singles in Λ . If $b' > 0$ then $f_{[\Lambda]_\spadesuit} = 1$.*

(b) *We have $\mathbf{a}_{[\Lambda]} = A_N - B_N$ where*

$$A_N = \sum_{i \in [1, N+r], j \in [1, N]} \inf(\lambda_i, \mu_j) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N+r} \inf(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \inf(\mu_i, \mu_j),$$

$$B_N = \sum_{i \in [1, N+r], j \in [1, N]} \inf(a(i-1) + b', a(j-1)) \\ + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N+r} \inf(a(i-1) + b', a(j-1) + b') + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \inf(a(i-1), a(j-1)).$$

It is enough to prove (a) assuming that N is large. Since

$A_{N+1} - A_N = a(N+r)N + a\binom{N}{2} + a\binom{N+r}{2} + b'N + b'(N+r) = B_{N+1} - B_N$, we have $A_{N+1} - B_{N+1} = A_N - B_N$ hence it is enough to prove (b) assuming that N is large. In the remainder of the proof we assume that N is large.

For $f, f' \in \mathbf{C}(v)$ we write $f \cong f'$ if $f' = fg$ with $g \in \mathbf{C}(v)$, $g|_{v=0} = 1$. Using 22.12, 22.13, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} f_{[\Lambda]_v} &\cong \prod_{i \in [1, N]} (v^{2a-2b} + 1)(v^{4a-2b} + 1) \dots (v^{2\mu_i-2b} + 1) \\ &\quad (v^b + v^{-b})^N v^{2a \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} (2i^2 - i)} \prod_{i, j \in [1, N]} (v^{2\lambda_{i+r}-b} + v^{2\mu_j-b})^{-1} \\ &\quad \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} (v^{2\lambda_{j+r}-2b} - v^{2\lambda_{i+r}-2b})^{-1} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} (v^{2\mu_j} - v^{2\mu_i})^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$f_{[\Lambda]_v} = 2^d v^{-K} + \text{higher powers of } v$$

where

$$d = 0 \text{ if } b' > 0,$$

$$\begin{aligned} d &= \sharp(j \in [1, N] : b \leq \mu_j) - \sharp(i, j \in [1, N] : \lambda_{i+r} = \mu_j) \\ &= N - \sharp(i \in [1, r], j \in [1, N] : (i-1)a = \mu_j) - \sharp(i, j \in [1, N] : \lambda_{i+r} = \mu_j) \\ &= N - \sharp(i \in [1, r], j \in [1, N] : \lambda_i = \mu_j) - \sharp(i, j \in [1, N] : \lambda_{i+r} = \mu_j) \\ &= N - \sharp(i \in [1, N+r], j \in [1, N] : \lambda_i = \mu_j) = (\sharp \text{ singles} - r)/2, \text{ if } b' = 0, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} -K &= -bN + 2a \sum_{i \in [1, N-1]} (2i^2 - i) + \sum_{j \in [1, N]} \sum_{\substack{k \in [1, r] \\ ak \leq \mu_j}} (2ak - 2b) \\ &\quad - \sum_{i, j \in [1, N]} (-b + 2 \inf(\lambda_{i+r}, \mu_j)) - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} (-2b + 2 \inf(\lambda_{i+r}, \lambda_{j+r})) \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} 2 \inf(\mu_i, \mu_j) = -bN + 2a \sum_{i \in [1, N-1]} (2i^2 - i) + 2bN^2 - bN \\ &\quad + \sum_{j \in [1, N]} \sum_{k \in [1, r], ak \leq \mu_j} (2ak - 2b) - \sum_{i, j \in [1, N]} 2 \inf(\lambda_{i+r}, \mu_j) \\ &\quad - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} 2 \inf(\lambda_{i+r}, \lambda_{j+r}) - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} 2 \inf(\mu_i, \mu_j) \\ &= \sum_{j \in [1, N]} \sum_{k \in [1, r], ak \leq \mu_j} (2ak - 2b) - \sum_{i, j \in [1, N]} 2 \inf(\lambda_{i+r}, \mu_j) \\ &\quad - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} 2 \inf(\lambda_{i+r}, \lambda_{j+r}) - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} 2 \inf(\mu_i, \mu_j) + \star. \end{aligned}$$

(We will generally write $\star$ for an expression which depends only on a, b, N .) We

have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\substack{j \in [1, N] \\ k \in [1, r] \\ ak \leq \mu_j}} (2ak - 2b) &= \sum_{\substack{j \in [1, r] \\ k \in [1, r] \\ ak \leq \mu_j}} (2ak - 2b) + \sum_{\substack{j \in [r+1, N] \\ k \in [1, r] \\ ak \leq \mu_j}} (2ak - 2b) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{j \in [1, r] \\ k \in [1, r] \\ ak \leq a(j-1)}} (2ak - 2b) + \sum_{\substack{j \in [r+1, N] \\ k \in [1, r]}} (2ak - 2b) = \star,
\end{aligned}$$

hence

$$-K = -2 \left(\sum_{i, j \in [1, N]} \inf(\lambda_{i+r}, \mu_j) - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \inf(\lambda_{i+r}, \lambda_{j+r}) - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \inf(\mu_i, \mu_j) \right) + \star.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i \in [1, r], j \in [1, N]} \inf(\lambda_i, \mu_j) &= \sum_{i \in [1, r], j \in [1, N]} \inf(a(i-1) + b', \mu_j) \\
&= \sum_{i \in [1, r], j \in [1, r]} \inf(a(i-1) + b', a(j-1)) + \sum_{i \in [1, r], j \in [r+1, N]} \inf(a(i-1) + b', \mu_j) \\
&= \sum_{i \in [1, r], j \in [1, r]} \inf(a(i-1) + b', a(j-1)) + \sum_{i \in [1, r], j \in [r+1, N]} (a(i-1) + b') = \star,
\end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\sum_{i, j \in [1, N]} \inf(\lambda_{i+r}, \mu_j) = \sum_{i \in [1, N+r], j \in [1, N]} \inf(\lambda_i, \mu_j) + \star.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N+r} \inf(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) &= \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \inf(\lambda_{i+r}, \lambda_{j+r}) + \sum_{i \in [1, r]} \lambda_i (N+r-i) \\
&= \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \inf(\lambda_{i+r}, \lambda_{j+r}) + \sum_{i \in [1, r]} (a(i-1) + b') (N+r-i) \\
&= \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \inf(\lambda_{i+r}, \lambda_{j+r}) + \star.
\end{aligned}$$

We see that

$$(c) \quad -K = -2A_N + \star.$$

In the special case where $\alpha = \beta = (0 \geq 0 \geq \dots)$ we have $K = 0$. On the other hand, by (c), we have $0 = -2B_N + \star$ where $\star$ is as in (c). Hence in general we have $-K = -2A_N + 2B_N$. This proves the proposition, in view of 20.11 and 20.21(a).

22.15. We identify $\mathfrak{S}_k \times W_l$ ($k + l = n$) with the subgroup of W consisting of all permutations in W which map $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ into itself (hence also map $\{1, 2, \dots, k'\}$ and $\{k + 1, \dots, n, n' \dots, (k + 1)'\}$ into themselves. This is a standard parabolic subgroup of W . We consider an irreducible representation of $\mathfrak{S}_k \times W_l$ of the form $\text{sgn}_k \boxtimes [\Lambda']$ where sgn_k is the sign representation of $\mathfrak{S}_k$ and $\Lambda' \in \text{Sy}_{a,b;l}^N$. We may assume that Λ' has at least k entries. We want to associate to Λ' a symbol in $\text{Sy}_{a,b;n}^N$ by increasing each of the k largest entries in Λ' by a . It may happen that the set of r largest entries of Λ' is not uniquely defined but there are two choices for it. (This can only happen if $b' = 0$.) Then the same procedure gives rise to two distinct symbols Λ^I, Λ^{II} in $\text{Sy}_{a,b;n}^N$.

Lemma 22.16. (a) $g_{(\text{sgn}_k \otimes [\Lambda'])_\bullet} = g_{[\Lambda']_\bullet}$ is equal to $g_{[\Lambda]_\bullet}$ or to $g_{[\Lambda^I]_\bullet} + g_{[\Lambda^{II}]_\bullet}$.
 (b) $\mathbf{a}_{\text{sgn}_k \otimes [\Lambda']} = a \binom{k}{2} + \mathbf{a}_{[\Lambda']}$ is equal to $\mathbf{a}_{[\Lambda]}$ or to $\mathbf{a}_{[\Lambda^I]} = \mathbf{a}_{[\Lambda^{II}]}$.

Λ , if defined, has the same number of singles as Λ' . Moreover, Λ^I (and Λ^{II}), if defined, has one more single than Λ' . Hence (a) follows from 22.14(a) using 20.18, 20.19.

By 22.14(b), the difference $\mathbf{a}_{[\tilde{\Lambda}]} - \mathbf{a}_{[\Lambda]}$ (where $\tilde{\Lambda}$ is either Λ or Λ^I or Λ^{II}) is a times the number of $i < j$ in $[1, k]$. Thus, it is $a \binom{k}{2}$. Hence (a) follows from 20.18, 20.19. The lemma is proved.

Lemma 22.17. $\mathbf{j}_{\mathfrak{S}_k \times W_l}^W(\text{sgn}_k \otimes [\Lambda'])$ equals $[\Lambda]$ or $[\Lambda^I] + [\Lambda^{II}]$.

By a direct computation (involving representations of symmetric groups) we see that:

- (a) if Λ is defined then $[[\Lambda'] : [\Lambda]] \geq 1$;
- (b) if Λ^I, Λ^{II} are defined then $[[\Lambda'] : [\Lambda^I]] \geq 1$ and $[[\Lambda'] : [\Lambda^{II}]] \geq 1$.

In the setup of (a) we have (by 20.14(b)):

$$g_{[\Lambda']_\bullet} = \sum_{E; \mathbf{a}_E = \mathbf{a}_{E'}} [[\Lambda'] : E] g_{E_\bullet} \text{ hence using 22.16(a) we have}$$

$$(c) g_{[\Lambda]_\bullet} = \sum_{E; \mathbf{a}_E = \mathbf{a}_{E'}} [[\Lambda'] : E] g_{E_\bullet}.$$

By 22.16(b), $E = [\Lambda]$ enters in the last sum and its contribution is $\geq g_{[\Lambda]_\bullet}$; the contribution of the other E is ≥ 0 (see 20.13(b)). Hence (c) forces $[[\Lambda'] : [\Lambda]] = 1$ and $[[\Lambda'] : E] = 0$ for all other E in the sum. In this case the lemma follows.

In the setup of (b) we have (by 20.14(b)):

$$g_{[\Lambda']_\bullet} = \sum_{E; \mathbf{a}_E = \mathbf{a}_{E'}} [[\Lambda'] : E] g_{E_\bullet} \text{ hence, using 22.16(a), we have}$$

$$(d) g_{[\Lambda^I]_\bullet} + g_{[\Lambda^{II}]_\bullet} = \sum_{E; \mathbf{a}_E = \mathbf{a}_{E'}} [[\Lambda'] : E] g_{E_\bullet}.$$

By 22.16(b), $E = [\Lambda^I]$ and $E = [\Lambda^{II}]$ enter in the last sum and their contribution is $\geq g_{[\Lambda^I]_\bullet} + g_{[\Lambda^{II}]_\bullet}$; the contribution of the other E is ≥ 0 (see 20.13(b)). Hence (d) forces $[[\Lambda'] : [\Lambda^I]] = [[\Lambda'] : [\Lambda^{II}]] = 1$ and $[[\Lambda'] : E] = 0$ for all other E in the sum. The lemma follows.

Lemma 22.18. $[\Lambda] \otimes \text{sgn} = [\bar{\Lambda}]$. (Notation of 22.14.)

This can be reduced to a known statement about the symmetric group. We omit the details.

22.19. Let Z be a totally ordered finite set $z_1 < z_2 < \cdots < z_M$. For any $r \in [0, M]$ such that $r = M \pmod{2}$ let $\underline{Z}_r$ be the set of subsets of Z of cardinal $(M - r)/2$. An involution $\iota : Z \rightarrow Z$ is said to be r -admissible if the following hold:

- (a) ι has exactly r fixed points;
- (b) if $M = r$, there is no further condition; if $M > r$, there exist two consecutive elements z, z' of Z such that $\iota(z) = z', \iota(z') = z$ and the induced involution of $Z - \{z, z'\}$ is r -admissible.

Let $\text{Inv}_r(Z)$ be the set of r -admissible involutions of Z . To $\iota \in \text{Inv}_r(Z)$ we associate a subset $\mathcal{S}_\iota$ of $\underline{Z}_r$ as follows: a subset $Y \subset Z$ is in $\mathcal{S}_\iota$ if it contains exactly one element in each non-trivial ι -orbit. Clearly $|\mathcal{S}_\iota| = 2^p$ where $p = (M - r)/2$. (In fact, $\mathcal{S}_\iota$ is naturally an affine space over the field F_2 .)

Lemma 22.20. *Assume that $p > 0$. Let $Y \in \underline{Z}_r$.*

- (a) *We can find two consecutive elements z, z' of Z such that exactly one of z, z' is in Y .*
- (b) *There exists $\iota \in \text{Inv}_r(Z)$ such that $Y \in \mathcal{S}_\iota$.*
- (c) *Assume that for some $k \in [0, p - 1]$, $z_1, z_2, \dots, z_k$ belong to Y but $z_{k+1} \notin Y$. Let l be the smallest number such that $l > k$ and $z_l \in Y$. There exists $\iota \in \text{Inv}_r(Z)$ such that $Y \in \mathcal{S}_\iota$ and $\iota(z_l) = z_{l-1}$.*

We prove (a). Let z_k be the smallest element of Y . If $k > 1$ then we can take $(z, z') = (z_{k-1}, z_k)$. Hence we may assume that $z_1 \in Y$. Let $z_{k'}$ be the next smallest element of Y . If $k' > 2$ then we can take $(z, z') = (z_{k'-1}, z_{k'})$. Continuing like this we see that we may assume that $Y = \{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_p\}$. Since $p < M$ we may take $(z, z') = (z_p, z_{p+1})$.

We prove (b). Let z, z' be as in (a). Let $Z' = Z - \{z, z'\}$ with the induced order. Let $Y' = Y \cap Z'$. If $p \geq 2$ then by induction on p we may assume that there exists $\iota' \in \text{Inv}_r(Z')$ such that $Y' \in \mathcal{S}_{\iota'}$. Extend ι' to an involution ι of Z by $z \mapsto z', z' \mapsto z$. Then $\iota \in \text{Inv}_r(Z)$ and $Y \in \mathcal{S}_\iota$. If $p = 1$, define $\iota : Z \rightarrow Z$ so that $z \mapsto z', z' \mapsto z$ and $\iota = 1$ on $Z - \{z, z'\}$. Then $\iota \in \text{Inv}_r(Z)$ and $Y \in \mathcal{S}_\iota$.

We prove (c). We have $l \geq k + 2$. Hence $z_{l-1} \notin Y$. Let $(z, z') = (z_{l-1}, z_l)$. We continue as in the proof of (b), except that instead of invoking an induction hypothesis, we invoke (b) itself.

22.21. Assume that $M > r$. We consider the graph whose set of vertices is $\underline{Z}_r$ and in which two vertices $Y \neq Y'$ are joined if there exists $\iota \in \text{Inv}_r(Z)$ such that $Y \in \mathcal{S}_\iota, Y' \in \mathcal{S}_\iota$.

Lemma 22.22. *This graph is connected.*

We show that any vertex $Y = \{z_{i_1}, z_{i_2}, \dots, z_{i_p}\}$ is in the same connected component as $Y_0 = \{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_p\}$. We argue by induction on $m_Y = i_1 + i_2 + \cdots + i_p$. If $m_Y = 1 + 2 + \cdots + p$ then $Y = Y_0$ and there is nothing to prove. Assume now that $m > 1 + 2 + \cdots + p$ so that $Y \neq Y_0$. Then the assumption of Lemma 22.20(c) is satisfied. Hence we can find l such that $z_l \in Y, z_{l-1} \notin Y$ and $\iota \in \text{Inv}_r(Z)$ such that $Y \in \mathcal{S}_\iota$ and $\iota(z_l) = z_{l-1}$. Let $Y' = (Y - \{z_l\}) \cup \{z_{l-1}\}$. Then $Y' \in \mathcal{S}_\iota$ hence

Y, Y' are joined in our graph. We have $m_{Y'} = m_Y - 1$ hence by the induction hypothesis Y', Y_0 are in the same connected component. It follows that Y, Y_0 are in the same connected component. The lemma is proved.

22.23. Assume that $b' = 0$. Let $\tilde{Z} \in \mathcal{M}_{a,b;n}^N$. Let Z be the set of singles of $\tilde{Z}$. Each set $Y \in \underline{Z}_r$ gives rise to a symbol Λ_Y in $\pi_N^{-1}(\tilde{Z})$: the first row of Λ_Y consists of $Z - Y$ and one of each double of $\tilde{Z}$; the second row consists of Y and one of each double of $\tilde{Z}$. For any $\iota \in \text{Inv}_r(Z)$ we define

$$c(\tilde{Z}, \iota) = \oplus_{Y \in \mathcal{S}_\iota} [\Lambda_Y] \in \text{Mod } W.$$

Proposition 22.24. (a) In the setup of 22.23, let $\iota \in \text{Inv}_r(Z)$. Then $c(\tilde{Z}, \iota) \in \text{Con}(W)$.

(b) All constructible representations of W are obtained as in (a).

We prove (a) by induction on n . If $n = 0$ the result is clear. Assume now that $n \geq 1$. We may assume that 0 is not a double of $\tilde{Z}$. Let at be the largest entry of $\tilde{Z}$.

(A) Assume that there exists $i, 0 \leq i < t$, such that ai does not appear in $\tilde{Z}$. Then $\tilde{Z}$ is obtained from $\tilde{Z}' \in \mathcal{M}_{a,b;n-k}^N$ with $n - k < n$ by increasing each of the k largest entries by a and this set of largest entries is unambiguously defined. The set Z' of singles of $\tilde{Z}'$ is naturally in order preserving bijection with Z . Let ι' correspond to ι under this bijection. By the induction hypothesis, $c(\tilde{Z}', \iota') \in \text{Con}(W_{n-k})$. Since, by 22.5, the sign representation sgn_k of $\mathfrak{S}_k$ is constructible, it follows that $\text{sgn}_k \boxtimes c(\tilde{Z}', \iota') \in \text{Con}(\mathfrak{S}_k \times W_{n-k})$. Using 22.17, we have

$$\mathbf{j}_{\mathfrak{S}_k \times W_{n-k}}^W(\text{sgn}_k \boxtimes c(\tilde{Z}', \iota')) = c(\tilde{Z}, \iota)$$

hence $c(\tilde{Z}, \iota) \in \text{Con}(W)$.

(B) Assume that there exists $i, 0 < i \leq t$ such that ai is a double of $\tilde{Z}$. Let $\bar{\tilde{Z}}$ be as in 22.8 (with respect to our t). Then 0 is not a double of $\bar{\tilde{Z}}$ and the largest entry of $\bar{\tilde{Z}}$ is at . Let $\bar{Z}$ be the set of singles of $\bar{\tilde{Z}}$. We have $\bar{Z} = \{at - z | z \in Z\}$. Thus $\bar{Z}, Z$ are naturally in (order reversing) bijection under $j \mapsto at - j$. Let $\iota' \in \text{Inv}_r(\bar{Z})$ correspond to ι under this bijection. Since $at - ai$ does not appear in $\bar{\tilde{Z}}$, (A) is applicable to $\bar{\tilde{Z}}$. Hence $c(\bar{\tilde{Z}}, \iota') \in \text{Con}(W)$. By 22.18 we have $c(\bar{\tilde{Z}}, \iota') \otimes \text{sgn} = c(\tilde{Z}, \iota)$ hence $c(\tilde{Z}, \iota) \in \text{Con}(W)$.

(C) Assume that we are not in case (A) and not in case (B). Then $\tilde{Z} = \{0, a, 2a, \dots, ta\} = Z$. We can find $ia, (i+1)a$ in Z such that ι interchanges $ia, (i+1)a$ and induces on $Z - \{ia, (i+1)a\}$ an r -admissible involution ι_1 . We have

$$\tilde{Z}' = \{0, a, 2a, \dots, ia, ia, (i+1)a, (i+2)a, \dots, (t-1)a\} \in \mathcal{M}_{a,b;n-k}^N$$

with $n - k < n$. The set of singles of $\tilde{Z}'$ is

$$Z' = \{0, a, 2a, \dots, (i-1)a, (i+1)a, \dots, (t-1)a\}.$$

It is in natural (order preserving) bijection with $Z - \{ia, (i+1)a\}$. Hence ι_1 induces

$\iota' \in \text{Inv}_r(Z')$. By the induction hypothesis we have $c(\tilde{Z}', \iota') \in \text{Con}(W_{n-k})$. Hence $\text{sgn}_k \boxtimes c(\tilde{Z}', \iota') \in \text{Con}(\mathfrak{S}_k \times W_{n-k})$ where sgn_k is as in (A). Using 22.17, we have

$$\mathbf{j}_{\mathfrak{S}_k \times W_{n-k}}^W(\text{sgn}_k \boxtimes c(\tilde{Z}', \iota')) = c(\tilde{Z}, \iota)$$

hence $c(\tilde{Z}, \iota) \in \text{Con}(W)$. This proves (a).

We prove (b) by induction on n . If $n = 0$ the result is clear. Assume now that $n \geq 1$. By an argument like the ones used in (B) we see that the class of representations of W obtained in (a) is closed under $\otimes \text{sgn}$. Therefore, to show that $C \in \text{Con}(W)$ is obtained in (a), we may assume that $C = \mathbf{j}_{\mathfrak{S}_k \times W_{n-k}}^W(C')$ for some $k > 0$ and some $C' \in \text{Con}(\mathfrak{S}_k \times W_{n-k})$. By 22.5 we have $C' = E \boxtimes C''$ where E is a simple $\mathfrak{S}_k$ -module and $C'' \in \text{Con}(W_{n-k})$. Using 22.5(a) we have $E = \mathbf{j}_{\mathfrak{S}_{k'} \times \mathfrak{S}_{k''}}^{\mathfrak{S}_k}(\text{sgn} \boxtimes E')$ where $k' + k'' = k$, $k' > 0$ and E' is a simple $\mathfrak{S}_{k''}$ -module. Let $\tilde{C} = \mathbf{j}_{\mathfrak{S}_{k'} \times W_{n-k'}}^{W_{n-k}}(E' \otimes C'') \in \text{Con}(W_{n-k'})$. Then $C = \mathbf{j}_{\mathfrak{S}_{k'} \times W_{n-k'}}^W(\text{sgn}_{k'} \otimes \tilde{C})$. By the induction hypothesis, $\tilde{C}$ is of the form described in (a). Using an argument as in (A) or (C) we deduce that C is of the form described in (a). The proposition is proved.

Proposition 22.25. *Assume that $b' > 0$.*

(a) *Let $E \in \text{Irr} W$. Then $E \in \text{Con}(W)$.*

(b) *All constructible representations of W are obtained as in (a).*

We prove (a). We may assume that $E = [\Lambda]$ where $\Lambda \in \text{Sy}_{a,b;n}^N$ does not contain both 0 and b' . We argue by induction on n . If $n = 0$ the result is clear. Assume now that $n \geq 1$.

(A) Assume that either (1) there exist two entries z, z' of Λ such that $z' - z > a$ and there is no entry z'' of Λ such that $z < z'' < z'$, or (2) there exists an entry z' of Λ such that $z' \geq a$ and there is no entry z'' of Λ such that $z'' < z'$. Let Λ' be the symbol obtained from Λ by subtracting a from each entry $\tilde{z}$ of Λ such that $\tilde{z} \geq z'$ and leaving the other entries of Λ unchanged. Then $\Lambda' \in \text{Sy}_{a,b;n-k}^N$ with $n - k < n$. By the induction hypothesis, $[\Lambda'] \in \text{Con}(W_{n-k})$. Since, by 22.5, the sign representation sgn_k of $\mathfrak{S}_k$ is constructible, it follows that $\text{sgn}_k \boxtimes [\Lambda'] \in \text{Con}(\mathfrak{S}_k \times W_{n-k})$. Using 22.17, we have $\mathbf{j}_{\mathfrak{S}_k \times W_{n-k}}^W(\text{sgn}_k \boxtimes [\Lambda']) = [\Lambda]$ hence $[\Lambda] \in \text{Con}(W)$.

(B) Assume that there exist two entries z, z' of Λ such that $0 < z' - z < a$. Let t be the smallest integer such that $at + b' \geq \lambda_i$ for all $i \in [1, N + r]$ and $at \geq \mu_j$ for all $j \in [1, N]$. Let $\bar{\Lambda} \in \text{Sy}_{a,b;n}^{t+1-N-r}$ be as in 22.8 with respect to this t . Then $\bar{\Lambda}$ does not contain both 0 and b' . Now (A) is applicable to $\bar{\Lambda}$. Hence $[\bar{\Lambda}] \in \text{Con}(W)$. By 22.18 we have $[\bar{\Lambda}] \otimes \text{sgn} = [\Lambda]$ hence $[\Lambda] \in \text{Con}(W)$.

(C) Assume that we are not in case (A) and not in case (B). Then the entries of Λ are either $0, a, 2a, \dots, ta$ or $b', a + b', 2a + b', \dots, ta + b'$. This cannot happen for $n \geq 1$. This proves (a).

The proof of (b) is entirely similar to that of 22.24(b). The proposition is proved.

22.26. We now assume that $n \geq 2$ and that $W' = W'_n$ is the kernel of $\chi_n : W_n \rightarrow \pm 1$ in 22.10. We regard W'_n as a Coxeter group with generators $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{n-1}$ as in 22.9 and $s'_n = (n-1, n')((n-1)', n)$ (product of transpositions). Let $L : W' \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ be the weight function given by $L(w) = al(w)$ for all w . Here $a > 0$.

For $\Lambda \in \text{Sy}_{a,0}^N$ we denote by Λ^{tr} the symbol whose first (resp. second) row is the second (resp. first) row of Λ . We then have $\Lambda^{tr} \in \text{Sy}_{a,0}^N$. From the definitions we see that the simple W_n -modules $[\Lambda], [\Lambda^{tr}]$ have the same restriction to W' ; this restriction is a simple W' -module $[\underline{\Lambda}]$ if $\Lambda \neq \Lambda^{tr}$ and is a direct sum of two non-isomorphic simple W' -modules $[{}^I\underline{\Lambda}], [{}^{II}\underline{\Lambda}]$ if $\Lambda = \Lambda^{tr}$. In this way we see that

the simple W' -modules are naturally in bijection with the set of orbits of the involution of $\text{Sy}_{a,0;n}$ induced by $\Lambda \mapsto \Lambda^{tr}$ except that each fixed point of this involution corresponds to two simple W' -modules.

Let $\tilde{Z} \in \mathcal{M}_{a,0;n}^N$. Let Z be the set of singles of $\tilde{Z}$. Assume first that $Z \neq \emptyset$. Each set $Y \in \underline{Z}_0$ gives rise to a symbol Λ_Y in $\text{Sy}_{a,0;n}^N$: the first row of Λ_Y consists of $Z - Y$ and one of each double of $\tilde{Z}$; the second row consists of Y and one of each double of $\tilde{Z}$. For any $\iota \in \text{Inv}_0(Z)$ we define $c(\tilde{Z}, \iota) \in \text{Mod} W$ by

$$c(\tilde{Z}, \iota) \oplus c(\tilde{Z}, \iota) = \oplus_{Y \in \mathcal{S}_\iota} [\Lambda_Y] \in \text{Mod} W.$$

Note that Y and $Z - Y$ have the same contribution to the sum. A proof entirely similar to that of 22.24 shows that $c(\tilde{Z}, \iota) \in \text{Con}(W)$. Moreover, if $Z = \emptyset$ and $\Lambda = \Lambda^{tr} \in \text{Sy}_{a,1;n}^N$ is defined by $\pi_N(\Lambda) = \tilde{Z}$, then $[{}^I\underline{\Lambda}] \in \text{Con}(W)$ and $[{}^{II}\underline{\Lambda}] \in \text{Con}(W)$. All constructible representations of W are obtained in this way.

22.27. Assume that W is of type F_4 and that the values of $L : W \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ on S are a, a, b, b where $a > b > 0$.

Case 1. Assume that $a = 2b$. There are four simple W -modules $\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_8, \rho_9$ (subscript equals dimension) with $\mathbf{a} = 3b$. Then

$$\rho_1 \oplus \rho_2, \rho_1 \oplus \rho_8, \rho_2 \oplus \rho_9, \rho_8 \oplus \rho_9 \in \text{Con}(W).$$

(They are obtained by $\mathbf{j}$ from the W_I of type B_3 with parameters a, b, b .)

The simple W -modules $\rho_1^\dagger, \rho_2^\dagger, \rho_8^\dagger, \rho_9^\dagger$ have $\mathbf{a} = 15b$ and

$$\rho_1^\dagger \oplus \rho_2^\dagger, \rho_1^\dagger \oplus \rho_8^\dagger, \rho_2^\dagger \oplus \rho_9^\dagger, \rho_8^\dagger \oplus \rho_9^\dagger \in \text{Con}(W).$$

There are five simple W -modules $\rho_{12}, \rho_{16}, \rho_6, \rho'_6, \rho_4$ (subscript equals dimension) with $\mathbf{a} = 7b$. Then

$$\rho_4 \oplus \rho_{16}, \rho_{12} \oplus \rho_{16} \oplus \rho_6, \rho_{12} \oplus \rho_{16} \oplus \rho'_6 \in \text{Con}(W).$$

All 12 simple W -modules other than the 13 listed above, are constructible. All constructible representations of W are thus obtained.

Case 2. Assume that $a \notin \{b, 2b\}$. The simple W -modules $\rho_{12}, \rho_{16}, \rho_6, \rho'_6, \rho_4$ in Case 1 now have $\mathbf{a} = 3a + b$ and

$$\rho_4 \oplus \rho_{16}, \rho_{12} \oplus \rho_{16} \oplus \rho_6, \rho_{12} \oplus \rho_{16} \oplus \rho'_6 \in \text{Con}(W).$$

All 20 simple W -modules other than the 5 listed above, are constructible. All constructible representations of W are thus obtained.

22.28. Assume that W is of type G_2 and that the values of $L : W \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ on S are a, b where $a > b > 0$. Let ρ_2, ρ'_2 be the two 2-dimensional simple W -modules.

They have $\mathbf{a} = a$ and $\rho_2 \oplus \rho'_2$ is constructible. All 4 simple W -modules other than the 2 listed above, are constructible. All constructible representations of W are thus obtained.

23. TWO-SIDED CELLS

23.1. We define a graph $\mathcal{G}_W$ as follows. The vertices of $\mathcal{G}_W$ are the simple W -modules up to isomorphism. Two non-isomorphic simple W -modules are joined in $\mathcal{G}_W$ if they both appear as components of some constructible representation of W . Let $\mathcal{G}_W / \sim$ be the set of connected components of $\mathcal{G}_W$. The connected components of $\mathcal{G} / \sim$ are determined explicitly by the results in §22 for W irreducible.

For example, in the setup of 22.4, 22.5 we have $\mathcal{G}_W = \mathcal{G}_W / \sim$. In the setup of 22.24, $\mathcal{G}_W / \sim$ is naturally in bijection with $\mathcal{M}_{a,b;n}$. (Here, 22.22 is used). In the setup of 22.25, we have $\mathcal{G}_W = \mathcal{G}_W / \sim$.

We show that:

(a) *if E, E' are in the same connected component of $\mathcal{G}_W$ then $E \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} E'$.*

We may assume that both E, E' appear in some constructible representation of W . By 22.2, there exists a left cell Γ such that $[E : [\Gamma]] \neq 0$, $[E' : [\Gamma]] \neq 0$. By 21.2, we have $[E_{\spadesuit} : J_{\mathbf{C}}^{\Gamma}] \neq 0$, $[E'_{\spadesuit} : J_{\mathbf{C}}^{\Gamma}] \neq 0$. Hence $E \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} E'$, as desired.

23.2. Let c_W be the set of two-sided cells of W, L . Consider the (surjective) map $\text{Irr}W \rightarrow c_W$ which to E associates the two-sided cell $\mathbf{c}$ such that $E \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} x$ for $x \in \mathbf{c}$. From 23.1 we see that this map induces a (surjective) map

(a) $\omega_W : \mathcal{G}_W / \sim \rightarrow c_W$.

We conjecture that ω_W is a bijection. This is made plausible by:

Proposition 23.3. *Assume that W, L is split. Then ω_W is a bijection.*

Let $E, E' \in \text{Irr}W$ be such that $E \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} E'$. By 22.3, we can find constructible representations C, C' such that $[E : C] \neq 0$, $[E' : C'] \neq 0$. By 22.2, we can find left cells Γ, Γ' such that $C = [\Gamma]$, $C' = [\Gamma']$. Then $[E : [\Gamma]] \neq 0$, $[E' : [\Gamma']] \neq 0$. Let $d \in \mathcal{D} \cap \Gamma$, $d' \in \mathcal{D} \cap \Gamma'$. Since $\gamma_d = [\Gamma]$ and $[E : [\Gamma]] \neq 0$, we have $E \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} d$. Similarly, $E' \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} d'$. Hence $d' \sim_{\mathcal{LR}} d$. By 18.4(c), there exists $u \in W$ such that $t_d t_u t_{d'} \neq 0$. (Here we use the splitness assumption.) Note that $j \mapsto j t_u t_{d'}$ is a $J_{\mathbf{C}}$ -linear map $J_{\mathbf{C}}^{\Gamma} \rightarrow J_{\mathbf{C}}^{\Gamma'}$. This map is non-zero since it takes t_d to $t_d t_u t_{d'} \neq 0$. Thus, $\text{Hom}_{J_{\mathbf{C}}}(J_{\mathbf{C}}^{\Gamma}, J_{\mathbf{C}}^{\Gamma'}) \neq 0$. Using 21.2, we deduce that $\text{Hom}_W([\Gamma], [\Gamma']) \neq 0$. Hence there exists $\tilde{E} \in \text{Irr}W$ such that $\tilde{E}$ is a component of both $[\Gamma] = C$ and $[\Gamma'] = C'$. Thus, both $E, \tilde{E}$ appear in C and both $\tilde{E}, E'$ appear in C' . Hence E, E' are in the same connected component of $\mathcal{G}_W$. The proposition is proved.

23.4. Assume now that W, L is quasisplit, associated as in 16.2 to $\tilde{W}$ and the automorphism $\sigma : \tilde{W} \rightarrow \tilde{W}$ with $\tilde{W}$ finite, irreducible.

Let $c_{\tilde{W}}^1$ be the set of all σ -stable two-sided cells of $\tilde{W}$. Let $c_{\tilde{W}}^{\#}$ be the set of all two-sided cells of $\tilde{W}$ which meet W . We have $c_{\tilde{W}}^{\#} \subset c_{\tilde{W}}^1 \subset c_{\tilde{W}}$. Let $f : c_W \rightarrow c_{\tilde{W}}^{\#}$ be the map which attaches to a two-sided cell of W the unique two-sided cell of $\tilde{W}$ containing it; this map is well defined by 16.13(a) and is obviously surjective.

Proposition 23.5. *In the setup of 23.4, ω_W is a bijection and $f : c_W \rightarrow c_{\tilde{W}}^\#$ is a bijection.*

Since ω_W, f are surjective, the composition $f\omega_W : \mathcal{G}_W / \sim \rightarrow c_{\tilde{W}}^\#$ is surjective. Hence it is enough to show that this composition is injective. For this it suffices to check one of the two statements below:

- (a) $|\mathcal{G}_W / \sim| = |c_{\tilde{W}}^\#|$;
- (b) the composition $\mathcal{G}_W / \sim \xrightarrow{f\omega_W} c_{\tilde{W}}^\# \subset c_{\tilde{W}} \xrightarrow{f'} \mathbf{N} \oplus \mathbf{N}$ (where $f'(\mathbf{c}) = (\mathbf{a}(x), \mathbf{a}(xw_0))$ for $x \in \mathbf{c}$) is injective.

Note that the value of the composition (b) at E is $(\mathbf{a}_E, \mathbf{a}_{E^\dagger})$.

Case 1. W is of type G_2 and $\tilde{W}$ is of type D_4 . Then (b) holds: the composition (b) takes distinct values $(0, 12), (1, 7), (3, 3), (7, 1), (12, 0)$ on the 5 elements of $\mathcal{G}_W / \sim$.

Case 2. W is of type F_4 and $\tilde{W}$ is of type E_6 . Then again (b) holds.

Case 3. W is of type B_n with $n \geq 2$ and $\tilde{W}$ is of type A_{2n} or A_{2n+1} . Then σ is conjugation by the longest element $\tilde{w}_0$ of $\tilde{W}$. We show that (a) holds.

Let Y be the set of all $E \in \text{Irr}\tilde{W}$ (up to isomorphism) such that $\text{tr}(\tilde{w}_0, E) \neq 0$. Let Y' be the set of all $E' \in \text{Irr}W$ (up to isomorphism). By 23.4 and 23.1 we have a natural bijection between $c_{\tilde{W}}$ and the set of isomorphism classes of $E \in \text{Irr}\tilde{W}$. If $\mathbf{c} \in c_{\tilde{W}}$ corresponds to E , then the number of fixed points of σ on $\mathbf{c}$ is clearly $\pm \dim(E)\text{tr}(\tilde{w}_0, E)$. Hence $|c_{\tilde{W}}^\#| = |Y|$. From 23.1 we have $|\mathcal{G}_W / \sim| = |Y|$. Hence to show (a) it suffices to show that $|Y| = |Y'|$. But this is shown in [L2].

Case 4. Assume that $\tilde{W}$ is of type D_n and W is of type B_{n-1} with $n \geq 3$. We will show that (a) holds. We change notation and write W' instead of $\tilde{W}$, W'^σ instead of W . Then W' is as in 22.26 and we may assume that $\sigma : W' \rightarrow W'$ is conjugation by s_n (as in 22.26). Let $\mathcal{M}_{1,0;n}^{N,!}$ be the set of all elements in $\mathcal{M}_{1,0;n}^N$ whose set of singles is non-empty. Let

$$\mathcal{M}_{1,0;n}^! = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}_{1,0;n}^{N,!}.$$

By 22.26 and 23.3, $c_{W'}^!$ is naturally in bijection with $\mathcal{M}_{1,0;n}^!$. By 23.1, $\mathcal{G}_{W'^\sigma} / \sim$ is naturally in bijection with $\mathcal{M}_{1,2;n-1}$. The identity map is clearly a bijection $\mathcal{M}_{1,2;n-1}^N \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{M}_{1,0;n}^{N+1,!}$. It induces a bijection $\mathcal{M}_{1,2;n-1} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{M}_{1,0;n}^!$. Hence to prove $|\mathcal{G}_{W'^\sigma} / \sim| \leq |c_{W'}^\#|$ it suffices to prove that $|\mathcal{M}_{1,0;n}^!| = |\mathcal{M}_{1,0;n}^\#|$. In other words, we must show that

(c) *any σ -stable two-sided cell of W' meets W'^σ .*

Now 26.26 and 23.3 provide an inductive procedure to obtain any σ -stable two-sided cell of W' . Namely such a cell is obtained by one of two procedures:

(i) we consider a σ -stable two-sided cell in a parabolic subgroup of type $\mathfrak{S}_k \times D_{n-k}$ (where $n - k \in [2, n - 1]$) and we attach to it the unique two-sided cell of W' that contains it;

(ii) we take a two-sided cell obtained in (i) and multiply it on the right by the longest element of W' .

Since we may assume that (c) holds when n is replaced by $n - k \in [2, n - 1]$, we

see that the procedures (i) and (ii) yield only two-sided cells that contain σ -fixed elements. This proves (c). The proposition is proved.

24. VIRTUAL CELLS

24.1. In this section we preserve the setup of 20.1.

A *virtual cell* of W (with respect to $L : W \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$) is an element of $K(W)$ of the form γ_x for some $x \in W$.

Lemma 24.2. *Let $x \in W$ and let Γ be the left cell containing x .*

(a) *If $\gamma_x \neq 0$ then $x \in \Gamma \cap \Gamma^{-1}$.*

(b) *γ_x is a $\mathbf{C}$ -linear combination of $E \in \text{Irr}W$ such that $[E : [\Gamma]] \neq 0$.*

Assume that $\gamma_x \neq 0$. Then there exists $\mathcal{E} \in \text{Irr}J_{\mathbf{C}}$ such that $\text{tr}(t_x, \mathcal{E}) \neq 0$. We have $\mathcal{E} = \bigoplus_{d \in \mathcal{D}} t_d \mathcal{E}$ and $t_x : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ maps the summand $t_d \mathcal{E}$ (where $x \sim_{\mathcal{L}} d$) into $t_{d'} \mathcal{E}$, where $d' \sim_{\mathcal{L}} x^{-1}$ and all other summands to 0. Since $\text{tr}(t_x, \mathcal{E}) \neq 0$, we must have $t_d \mathcal{E} = t_{d'} \mathcal{E} \neq 0$ hence $d = d'$ and $x \sim_{\mathcal{L}} x^{-1}$. This proves (a).

We prove (b). Let $d \in \mathcal{D} \cap \Gamma$. Assume that $E \in \text{Irr}W$ appears with $\neq 0$ coefficient in γ_x . Then $\text{tr}(t_x, E_{\spadesuit}) \neq 0$. As we have seen in the proof of (a), we have $t_d E_{\spadesuit} \neq 0$. Using 21.3, 21.2, we deduce $[E_{\spadesuit} : J_{\mathbf{C}}^{\Gamma}] \neq 0$ and $[E_{\spadesuit} : [\Gamma]_{\spadesuit}] \neq 0$. Hence $[E : [\Gamma]] \neq 0$. The lemma is proved.

24.3. In the remainder of this section we will give a number of explicit computations of virtual cells.

Lemma 24.4. *In the setup of 22.10, w_0 acts on $[\Lambda]$ as multiplication by*

$$\epsilon_{[\Lambda]} = (-1)^{\sum_j (a^{-1} \mu_j - j + 1)}.$$

Using the definitions we are reduced to the case where $k = n$ or $l = n$. If $k = n$ we have $\epsilon_{[\Lambda]} = 1$ since $[\Lambda]$ factors through $\mathfrak{S}_n$ and the longest element of W_n is in the kernel of $W_n \rightarrow \mathfrak{S}_n$. Similarly, if $l = n$ we have $\epsilon_{[\Lambda]} = \epsilon_{\chi_n} = (-1)^n$. The lemma is proved.

Proposition 24.5. *Assume that we are in the setup of 22.23. Let $\iota \in \text{Inv}_r(Z)$ and let $\kappa : \mathcal{S}_l \rightarrow F_2$ be an affine-linear function. Let $c(\tilde{Z}, \iota, \kappa) = \sum_{Y \in \mathcal{S}_l} (-1)^{\kappa(Y)} [\Lambda_Y] \in K(W)$. There exists $x \in W$ such that $\gamma_x = \pm c(\tilde{Z}, \iota, \kappa)$.*

To some extent the proof is a repetition of the proof of 22.24(a), but we have to keep track of κ , a complicating factor.

We argue by induction on the rank n of $\tilde{Z}$. If $n = 0$ the result is clear. Assume now that $n \geq 1$. We may assume that 0 is not a double of $\tilde{Z}$. Let at be the largest entry of $\tilde{Z}$.

(A) Assume that there exists $i, 0 \leq i < t$, such that ai does not appear in $\tilde{Z}$. Then $\tilde{Z}$ is obtained from a multiset $\tilde{Z}'$ of rank $n - k < n$ by increasing each of the k largest entries by a and this set of largest entries is unambiguously defined. The set Z' of singles of $\tilde{Z}'$ is naturally in bijection with Z .

Let ι', κ' correspond to ι, κ under this bijection. By the induction hypothesis, there exists $x' \in W_{n-k}$ such that $\gamma_{x'}^{W_{n-k}} = \pm c(\tilde{Z}', \iota', \kappa') \in K(W_{n-k})$. Let $w_{0,k}$ be the longest element of $\mathfrak{S}_k$. Then

$$\gamma_{w_{0,k}x'}^{\mathfrak{S}_k \times W_{n-k}} = \gamma_{w_{0,k}}^{\mathfrak{S}_k} \boxtimes \gamma_{x'}^{W_{n-k}} = \text{sgn}_k \boxtimes \gamma_{x'}^{W_{n-k}}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{w_{0,k}x'}^W &= \mathbf{j}_{\mathfrak{S}_k \times W_{n-k}}^W (\gamma_{w_{0,k}x'}^{\mathfrak{S}_k \times W_{n-k}}) \\ &= \mathbf{j}_{\mathfrak{S}_k \times W_{n-k}}^W (\text{sgn}_k \boxtimes \gamma_{x'}^{W_{n-k}}) = \pm \mathbf{j}_{\mathfrak{S}_k \times W_{n-k}}^W (\text{sgn}_k \boxtimes c(\tilde{Z}', \iota', \kappa')) = \pm c(\tilde{Z}, \iota, \kappa), \end{aligned}$$

as required.

(B) Assume that there exists $i, 0 < i \leq t$ such that ai is a double of $\tilde{Z}$. Let $\tilde{\tilde{Z}}$ be as in 22.8 (with respect to our t). Then 0 is not a double of $\tilde{\tilde{Z}}$ and the largest entry of $\tilde{\tilde{Z}}$ is at . Let $\bar{Z}$ be the set of singles of $\tilde{\tilde{Z}}$. We have $\bar{Z} = \{at - z | z \in Z\}$. Thus $\bar{Z}, Z$ are naturally in (order reversing) bijection under $j \mapsto at - j$. Let $\iota' \in \text{Inv}_r(\bar{Z})$ correspond to ι this bijection and let $\kappa' : \mathcal{S}_{\iota'} \rightarrow F_2$ correspond to κ under this bijection. Let $\kappa'' : \mathcal{S}_{\iota'} \rightarrow F_2$ be given by $\kappa''(Y) = \kappa'(Y) + \sum_{y \in Y} a^{-1}y$ (an affine-linear function). Since $at - ai$ does not appear in $\tilde{\tilde{Z}}$, (A) is applicable to $\tilde{\tilde{Z}}$. Hence there exists $x' \in W$ such that

$$\gamma_{x'} = \pm c(\tilde{\tilde{Z}}, \iota', \kappa''). \text{ By 20.23, 22.18, 24.4, we have}$$

$$\gamma_{x'w_0} = (-1)^{l(x')} \zeta(\gamma_{x'}) = \pm \zeta(c(\tilde{\tilde{Z}}, \iota', \kappa'')) \otimes \text{sgn} = \pm c(\tilde{\tilde{Z}}, \iota', \kappa') \otimes \text{sgn} = \pm c(\tilde{Z}, \iota, \kappa),$$

as desired.

(C) Assume that we are not in case (A) and not in case (B). Then $\tilde{Z} = \{0, a, 2a, \dots, ta\} = Z$. We can find $ia, (i+1)a$ in Z such that ι interchanges $ia, (i+1)a$ and induces on $Z - \{ia, (i+1)a\}$ an r -admissible involution ι_1 .

(C1) Assume first that $\kappa(Y) = \kappa(Y * \{ia, (i+1)a\})$ for any $Y \in \mathcal{S}_\iota$. ($*$ is symmetric difference.) Let

$$\tilde{Z}' = \{0, a, 2a, \dots, ia, ia, (i+1)a, (i+2)a, \dots, (t-1)a\}.$$

This has rank $n - k < n$. The set of singles of $\tilde{Z}'$ is

$$Z' = \{0, a, 2a, \dots, (i-1)a, (i+1)a, \dots, (t-1)a\}.$$

It is in natural (order preserving) bijection with $Z - \{ia, (i+1)a\}$. Hence ι_1 induces $\iota' \in \text{Inv}_r(Z')$. We have an obvious surjective map of affine spaces $p : \mathcal{S}_\iota \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\iota'}$ and κ is constant on the fibres of this map. Hence there is an affine-linear map $\kappa' : \mathcal{S}_{\iota'} \rightarrow F_2$ such that $\kappa = \kappa'p$. By the induction hypothesis, there exists $x' \in W_{n-k}$ such that $\gamma_{x'}^{W_{n-k}} = \pm c(\tilde{Z}', \iota', \kappa') \in K(W_{n-k})$. Let $w_{0,k}$ be the longest element of $\mathfrak{S}_k$. Then

$$\gamma_{w_{0,k}x'}^{\mathfrak{S}_k \times W_{n-k}} = \gamma_{w_{0,k}}^{\mathfrak{S}_k} \boxtimes \gamma_{x'}^{W_{n-k}} = \text{sgn}_k \boxtimes \gamma_{x'}^{W_{n-k}}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_{w_0, k}^W &= \mathbf{j}_{\mathfrak{S}_k \times W_{n-k}}^W (\gamma_{w_0, k}^{\mathfrak{S}_k \times W_{n-k}}) \\ &= \mathbf{j}_{\mathfrak{S}_k \times W_{n-k}}^W (\text{sgn}_k \boxtimes \gamma_{x'}^{W_{n-k}}) = \pm \mathbf{j}_{\mathfrak{S}_k \times W_{n-k}}^W (\text{sgn}_k \boxtimes c(\tilde{Z}', \iota', \kappa')) = \pm c(\tilde{Z}, \iota, \kappa),\end{aligned}$$

as required.

(C2) Assume next that $\kappa(Y) \neq \kappa(Y * \{ia, (i+1)a\})$ for some (or equivalently any) $Y \in \mathcal{S}_\iota$. We have

$$\bar{\tilde{Z}} = \{0, 0, a, a, 2a, 2a, \dots, ta, ta\} - \{at - 0, at - a, \dots, at - at\} = \tilde{Z} = Z.$$

Let $\iota' \in \text{Inv}_r(Z)$ correspond to ι under the bijection $z \mapsto ta - z$ of Z with itself; let $\kappa' : \mathcal{S}_{\iota'} \rightarrow F_2$ correspond to κ under this bijection. Let $\kappa'' : \mathcal{S}_{\iota'} \rightarrow F_2$ be given by $\kappa''(Y) = \kappa'(Y) + \sum_{y \in Y} a^{-1}y$ (an affine-linear function). Note that ι' interchanges $(t-i-1)a, (t-i)a$ and induces on $Z - \{(t-i-1)a, (t-i)a\}$ an r -admissible involution. We show that for any $Y \in \mathcal{S}_{\iota'}$ we have $\kappa''(Y) = \kappa''(Y * \{(t-i-1)a, (t-i)a\})$ or equivalently $\kappa'(Y) = \kappa'(Y * \{(t-i-1)a, (t-i)a\}) + 1$. This follows from our assumption $\kappa(Y) = \kappa(Y * \{ia, (i+1)a\}) + 1$ for any $Y \in \mathcal{S}_\iota$. We see that case (C1) applies to ι', κ'' so that there exists $x' \in W$ with $\gamma_{x'} = \pm c(\tilde{Z}, \iota', \kappa'')$. By 20.23, 22.18, 24.4, we have

$$\gamma_{x'w_0} = (-1)^{l(x')} \zeta(\gamma_{x'}) = \pm \zeta(c(\tilde{Z}, \iota', \kappa'')) \otimes \text{sgn} = \pm c(\tilde{Z}, \iota', \kappa') \otimes \text{sgn} = \pm c(\tilde{Z}, \iota, \kappa),$$

as desired. The proposition is proved.

24.6. Assume that we are in the setup of 22.27. By 22.27,

$\rho_4 + \rho_{16}, \rho_{12} + \rho_{16} + \rho_6, \rho_{12} + \rho_{16} + \rho'_6$ are constructible, hence (by 22.2, 21.4) are of the form $n_d \gamma_d$ for suitable $d \in \mathcal{D}$, hence are $\pm$ virtual cells.

Let $d \in \mathcal{D}$ be such that $n_d \gamma_d = \rho_{12} + \rho_{16} + \rho_6$. Let Γ be the left cell such that $d \in \Gamma$. Recall (21.4) that $[\Gamma] = A \oplus B \oplus C$ where $A = \rho_{12}, B = \rho_{16}, C = \rho_6$. By the discussion in 21.10 we see that $J_{\mathbf{C}}^{\Gamma \cap \Gamma^{-1}}$ has exactly three simple modules (up to isomorphism), namely $t_d A_\spadesuit, t_d B_\spadesuit, t_d C_\spadesuit$, and these are 1-dimensional. Since $J^{\Gamma \cap \Gamma^{-1}}$ is a semisimple algebra (21.9), it follows that it is commutative of dimension 3. Hence $\Gamma \cap \Gamma^{-1}$ consists of three elements d, x, y . Let p_A, p_B, p_C denote the traces of t_x on $A_\spadesuit, B_\spadesuit, C_\spadesuit$ respectively. Let q_A, q_B, q_C denote the traces of t_y on $A_\spadesuit, B_\spadesuit, C_\spadesuit$ respectively. By 20.24, $p_A, p_B, p_C, q_A, q_B, q_C$ are integers. Recall that the traces of $n_d t_d$ on $A_\spadesuit, B_\spadesuit, C_\spadesuit$ are 1, 1, 1 respectively. Since $f_{A_\spadesuit}, f_{B_\spadesuit}, f_{C_\spadesuit}$ are 6, 2, 3 we see that the orthogonality formula 21.10 gives

$$1 + p_A^2 + q_A^2 = 6, 1 + p_B^2 + q_B^2 = 2, 1 + p_C^2 + q_C^2 = 3,$$

$$1 + p_A p_B + q_A q_B = 0, 1 + p_A p_C + q_A q_C = 0, 1 + p_B p_C + q_B q_C = 0.$$

Solving these equations with integer unknowns we see that there exist $\epsilon, \epsilon' \in \{1, -1\}$ so that (up to interchanging x, y) we have

$$(p_A, q_A) = (2\epsilon, \epsilon'), (p_B, q_B) = (0, -\epsilon'), (p_C, q_C) = (-\epsilon, \epsilon').$$

Then $\epsilon\gamma_x = 2\rho_{12} - \rho_6$, $\epsilon'\gamma_y = \rho_{12} - \rho_{16} + \rho_6$. Hence

$$2\rho_{12} - \rho_6, \rho_{12} - \rho_{16} + \rho_6 \text{ are } \pm \text{ virtual cells.}$$

Exactly the same argument shows that

$$2\rho_{12} - \rho_{6'}, \rho_{12} - \rho_{16} + \rho_{6'} \text{ are } \pm \text{ virtual cells.}$$

A similar (but simpler) argument shows that

$$\rho_4 - \rho_{16} \text{ is } \pm \text{ a virtual cell.}$$

Assume now that we are in the setup of 22.27 (Case 1). By 22.27,

$$\rho_1 + \rho_2, \rho_1 + \rho_8, \rho_2 + \rho_9, \rho_8 + \rho_9, \rho_1^\dagger + \rho_2^\dagger, \rho_1^\dagger + \rho_8^\dagger, \rho_2^\dagger + \rho_9^\dagger, \rho_8^\dagger + \rho_9^\dagger,$$

are constructible, hence by 22.2, 21.4 are of the form $n_d\gamma_d$ for suitable $d \in \mathcal{D}$, hence are $\pm$ virtual cells. By an argument similar to that above (but simpler) we see that

$$\rho_1 - \rho_2, \rho_1 - \rho_8, \rho_2 - \rho_9, \rho_8 - \rho_9, \rho_1^\dagger - \rho_2^\dagger, \rho_1^\dagger - \rho_8^\dagger, \rho_2^\dagger - \rho_9^\dagger, \rho_8^\dagger - \rho_9^\dagger,$$

are $\pm$ virtual cells.

24.7. Assume that we are in the setup of 22.29. By 22.29, $\rho_2 + \rho'_2$ is constructible, hence by 22.2, 21.4, is of the form $n_d\gamma_d$ for some $d \in \mathcal{D}$, hence is $\pm$ a virtual cell. As in 24.6, we see that $\rho_2 - \rho'_2$ is $\pm$ a virtual cell.

REFERENCES

- [B] N.Bourbaki, *Groupes et algèbres de Lie, Ch. 4, 5, 6*, Hermann, Paris, 1968.
- [Br] K.Bremke, *Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials and cells for affine Weyl groups and unequal parameters*, Thesis, M.I.T. (1996).
- [Ho] P.N.Hoefsmit, *Representations of Hecke algebras of finite groups with BN-pairs of classical type*, Thesis, Univ. of British Columbia, Vancouver (1994).
- [KL] D.Kazhdan and G.Lusztig, *Representations of Coxeter groups and Hecke algebras*, Invent. Math. **53** (1979), 165-184.
- [L1] G.Lusztig, *Unipotent characters of the Symplectic and odd orthogonal groups over a finite field*, Invent. Math. **64** (1981), 263-296.
- [L2] G.Lusztig, *Left cells in Weyl groups*, Lie group representations, I, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1024, Springer Verlag, 1983, pp. 99-111.
- [L3] G.Lusztig, *Cells in affine Weyl groups*, Algebraic groups and related topics, Adv.Stud.Pure Math. 6, North-Holland and Kinokuniya, Tokyo and Amsterdam, 1985, pp. 255-287.
- [L4] G.Lusztig, *Cells in affine Weyl groups, II*, J.Algebra **109** (1987), 536-548.
- [L5] G.Lusztig, *Leading coefficients of character values of Hecke algebras*, Proc. Symp.Pure Math. **47** (1987), 235-262.